

ON THE USAGE

OF

QUOTIENS AND QUOTIENSCUNQUE

DIFFERENT PERIODS OF LATIN.

AUG 2 1902

A DISSERTATION

PRESENTED TO THE BOARD OF UNIVERSITY STUDIES OF
THE JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY FOR THE
DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY.

BY

OMERA FLOYD LONG,
SOMETIME UNIVERSITY SCHOLAR AND FELLOW.

BALTIMORE:
JOHN MURPHY COMPANY.
1901.

31761 096208129

ON THE USAGE
OF
QUOTIENS AND QUOTIENSCUNQUE
IN
DIFFERENT PERIODS OF LATIN.

A DISSERTATION

PRESENTED TO THE BOARD OF UNIVERSITY STUDIES OF
THE JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY FOR THE
DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY.

BY

OMERA FLOYD LONG,
SOMETIME UNIVERSITY SCHOLAR AND FELLOW.

BALTIMORE:
JOHN MURPHY COMPANY.
1901.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT.

During my graduate work courses were pursued under Professors Warren, Gildersleeve and Bloomfield, and Associate Professor Smith. To each of these I can but imperfectly express my gratitude for various kindnesses, and for lasting inspiration as well as helpful instruction.

Owing to the range of authors cited in my examples the manuscript of this dissertation, though complete in its inferences and its main outlines, was at first submitted in provisional form. Later a visit to Munich enabled me through the generous courtesy of Professor Wölfflin to verify many of my references with the help of the "Thesauruszettel." Professor Wölfflin himself, at various points in the revision, gave helpful suggestions, such as emphasis on *quam saepe*, of which I had at that time only a few of the more striking examples, pointing out the occurrence of *nescio quotiens* in the *Notae Tironianae*, and additional examples of *quotienslibet*, together with remarks on gemination in connection with the compound form. Further points of indebtedness will be acknowledged as far as possible in the following pages by reference to his *Zusätze* in an abstract of this dissertation which appeared in the *Archiv für lateinische Lexikographie und Grammatik*, xi, p. 395 ff.—an abstract due also to Professor Wölfflin's generous suggestion.

O. F. LONG.

NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY,
EVANSTON, ILLINOIS.

CONTENTS.

	PAGE.
INTRODUCTION, - - - - -	7-8
PART I.	
DERIVATION, - - - - -	9-11
FORM, - - - - -	11-13
COMPOUNDS, - - - - -	13-19
MEANING, - - - - -	19-23
AUTHORS EXAMINED, - - - - -	23-24
PART II.	
CITATION OF EXAMPLES, - - - - -	25-35
PART III.	
SUMMARY, - - - - -	36-48

INTRODUCTION.

Little or nothing hitherto has been written with reference to *quotiens*. The grammarians have been content with brief statements as to its general usage, which was assumed as well understood. Hand's *Tursellinus, De Particulis Linguae Latinae* was interrupted before reaching *quotiens*; Reisig's *Vorlesungen über lateinische Sprachwissenschaft*, with its various revisions, has nothing; Draeger, *Historische Syntax der lateinischen Sprache*,² II, p. 584, dismisses the word after stating in substance that it is found with the indicative in classical Latin, while in the period of silver Latin and later many authors use the subjunctive mode. Only a few examples, however, are cited by Draeger. Here and there, in a line, an editor has discussed the form of *quotiens*, or perhaps has noted its substitution for *ubi*, *cum* or *si quando*. The form has naturally been discussed with greatest fullness by Neue, *Formenlehre der lateinischen Sprache*, and by Brambach, *die Neugestaltung der lateinischen Orthographie*. On the more difficult question of *quotiens* with the subjunctive in iterative sentences, practically nothing has been contributed beyond the brief paragraph in Draeger. Such works as have been helpful in the discussion of this phase of the subject have been quoted in Part III.

It is obvious, however, that for any final judgment in syntax the historical perspective must be used, and each individual word, with any possible alternatives before it, must give a complete account of itself. The desired results may ultimately be reached by investigating every point in individual authors, successively, until the literature has been covered; or by following a single usage through approximately all the authors, until the various moot-points have thus been historically treated. The present paper offers some such treatment of *quotiens*. The ante-classical

and classical literature has been thoroughly covered, and there are but few omissions in the later period extending as far down as Boethius and Gregory of Tours. Altogether, about one hundred and thirty authors have been examined.

The collection of examples has of course been made with the help of special lexicons and indices verborum where these were available and trustworthy. In most cases, however, the instances had to be collected for the first time; accordingly, the privilege of "*ni fallor*" is asked for in stating totals. It may be claimed with confidence that the general usage for the long period considered has been accurately shown, since the possible omission of an example here and there would make no material difference in the results obtained.

PART I.

DERIVATION.

Quotiens is formed with *quot* as its basis, as *totiens* from *tot*, or the post-classical *multotiens* from *multus*, plus the suffix *-iens*, making a derivative analogous with the multiplicative numerals in *-ies* (*-iens*). Various explanations for this suffix have been proposed, any one of which, if satisfactory for one word, would suffice for the entire group, since the principle of analogy, powerful everywhere, is especially strong in the case of numerals.¹ Some of these may be examined.

a. Aufrecht, Die lateinischen Zahladverbien auf *-iens*, K. Z. I, 121 ff., holds that *-iens* represents a neuter comparative suffix to be compared with the neuter adjective suffix *-ius* (*-ios*). This view has little probability from either the phonetic side or the meaning, and apparently finds no support from later scholars.²

b. Joh. Schmidt, K. Z. xxv, 137 anm. 2, would equate *triens* (= **triīns*) directly with *τριάς*, from which we might suppose other forms spread. Brugmann,³ however, is right in rejecting this equation as unwarranted.

c. In the Archiv für lateinische Lexikographie und Grammatik, v, 136 f., Stowasser has proposed a new explanation, based upon the simple juxtaposition of the participle *iens* with *quot*, *tot*, etc.; so, for example, he cites Verg. *Æn.* 6, 122

Itque reditque viam tot iens.

i. e., *tot* < *itiones* > *iens* “in soviel Gängen”; and similarly with other forms in *-ies* (*-iens*), as *quinqu(e) iens*, *sex iens*, *sept(em) iens*,

¹ Cf. Osthoff, Morphologische Untersuchungen, I, 92 ff., and Baunack, Kuhn's Zeitschrift f. vergl. Sprachforschung, xxv, 253.

² Corssen, Aussprache, Vokalismus u. Betonung d. lat. Sprache, II, pp. 351, 552 anm., must be excepted.

³ Grundr. d. vergl. Gram. II, 368.

etc. The formation entered the language very early, before the present law for accentuation obtained, and readily took on a numeral connotation on account of the Latin aversion to such a construction.

That this view simplifies the phonetic difficulties can hardly be denied, and a similar phenomenon has been pointed out¹ in the periphrastically formed multiplicatives of Anglo-Saxon, where *sið* "journey" is added to both ordinals and cardinals,² and of Hebrew, which makes a similar use of *paam* "step, walk."³ Thurneysen⁴ dismisses this explanation as "künstlich"; but Delbrück⁵ approves it, Deecke⁶ also, and one must admit that it is rather seductive, although the principle of juxtaposition and reduction is on the whole unscientific, and accordingly to be accepted in any case with great caution.⁷

d. Bréal, *Mémoires de la Société de Linguistique de Paris*, VIII, 474, like Stowasser, has also attempted an explanation on Latin ground. From *quotus*, "how many," with the nominal suffix *-ia*, *-ie*, which is used secondarily (cf. *mater-iē-s*, *temper-iē-s*, etc.), he would make a derivative *quoties*,⁸ i. e., to form a proportion, *quotus : quoties :: quantus : quantitas*, or *qualis : qualitas*. From this formation *decies*, *centies*, etc., would follow by analogy; but the persistency with which *n* clings in *quotiens* and its regular occurrence early in the numerals are against Bréal's view,⁹ even if the meaning could have been reached in this way, which may be doubted.

e. Still another, and, on the whole, more satisfactory derivation, is offered by Thurneysen, *Zu den Zahladverbien auf -iens*, ALL. V, 575. Here it is rightly assumed that the suffix did not

¹ See Kellner's note on Stowasser's article, I. I.

² Cf. Bosworth-Tallieur, *Lex. Ang.-Sax.*, s. v.

³ Cf. Gesenius, *Hebr. u. Chald. Wörterb.*, s. v. ⁴ ALL. V, 575; cf. *infra*.

⁵ Vergl. *Synt.* p. 628.

⁶ *Erläuterungen z. lat. Schulgram.* § 71, 1.

⁷ See Stoltz, ALL. V, 285, and Müller's *Handb. d. klass. Altertumswissenschaft*, II³, 2 Abteil. p. 145.

⁸ "Nous avons ici une expression technique venue de la langue du calcul. C'est-à-dire un substantif désignant l'un des facteurs de la multiplication ou de la division."

⁹ Though he generously allows *n* to be from an old acc. plur., preserved by "pét्रification adverbiale," or else parasitic.

originate on Italian soil. The word *quotiens* itself may be compared with Skr. *kiyant*,¹ "how great, how many," whose neuter, *kiyat*, employed adverbially, is taken as the starting point. From *-yat*, with a basis of *int*, *nasalis sonans* having entered, assume Ital. *-ient*, which appears as *-iens* through a change of *-nt* to *-ns*. This change is warranted by what we see in the Oscan and Umbrian verbs, where the ending *-ns* of the third plural in secondary tenses stands for original *-nt*, while the final *-nt* of the primary tenses stands for Ind.-Ger. *-nti*;² but, since ordinarily final *-ns* became *-f*, it must be assumed on Thurneysen's hypothesis that the change of *-nt* to *-ns* is not primitive Italic. Von Planta, I. l., has suggested that the Osc.-Umbr. *-nt* first became *nd* (cf. the change of *-t* to *d* in the third sing. of secondary tenses), then *-nd* > *-nz*, through *-nð*, and *-nz* naturally became *-ns*. Here again we must suppose *-nd* > *-nð* before the Osc.-Umbr. assimilation of *-nd* to *-nn*.³ A similar change would be that of the neuter participle *ferens* = **ferent* (cf. Skr. *bharat*, Ind.-Ger. **bhernt*), perhaps after the analogy of adjectives like *ingens*, etc.⁴

This view of Thurneysen's, while not wholly free from phonetic difficulties, is accepted by Brugmann,⁵ Stolz,⁶ Lindsay,⁷ and may be regarded as the most satisfactory yet offered.

FORM.

In the case of the multiplicatives, the classical form, from five on, is with the ending *-ies*, for the earlier *-iens*, though the earlier forms were often retained by the side of the later ones.⁸ This elimination of *n* before *s* was of not infrequent occurrence even in old inscriptions, as the familiar *mesibus*, *cosul*, *cesor*, etc., attest, and was doubtless due to a certain nasal quality assumed by the

¹ Pron. *ki* (Lat. *qui*), plus the suffix *-yant*. Cf. *quot* with *kati*.

² Cf. Bugge, K. Z. xxii, 385 ff., and von Planta, Gram. d. osk.-umbr. Dialekte, Strassburg, 1892, I, p. 513. ³ See von Planta, p. 417 f.

⁴ Thurneysen, I. l., and Stolz, Handb. II³, 2, 145.

⁵ Grundr. Vergl. Gram. II, 562.

⁶ ALL. v, 285; Handb. II³, 2, 145.

⁷ Lat. Lang. pp. 284, 409.

⁸ Prisc. Corp. Gram. III, 77, 15 ff.; Lindsay, p. 408.

preceding vowel, so that the consonantal element was more and more reduced, even to the point of total disappearance.¹

Later, even the *-ies* in the definite numerals was often reduced to *-is*, both in literature and in inscriptions, as *decis*, *sexsis*, CIL. XII, 2087 (559 A. D.).²

With the indefinite *quotiens*, *aliquotiens*, *totiens* and *multotiens*, however, the best tradition favors the retention of *-iens*. The statements of the grammarians show the actual practice. Compare Priscian, Corp. Gram. III, 415, 18 *reliqua omnia in es productam desinunt . . . infinitis tamen numerorum adverbii etiam n interponitur, quotiens, totiens similiter multotiens*. Marius Victorinus, ibid. VI, 24, 23, and Caper VII, 95, 8, are equally insistent. The *n* seems to have fallen out entirely at last, for while Albinus VII, 308, 14 at least reports that formerly the *n* was used: *quoties, toties sine n, licet veteres per n*, Beda VII, 287, 5 makes no reservation: *quoties, toties, septies, sine n*.

The inscriptions and literature show that Priscian's rule was not arbitrarily formed,³ but was based upon practice. Augustus, in the Mon. Anc., has only *quotiencunque* (IV, 28) by the side of the earlier forms—*deciens*, *viciens*, *quadragiens*, *sescentiens*, etc.,⁴ and similarly *quotiens* is the form in both the Lex Agraria and the Lex Repetundarum, CIL. I, 200, z. 25; I, 198, z. 48. Compare further II, 1963, col. 1, z. 38–39; II, 3367, and O.-H. 4358, z. 20; 4374, z. 16.

For the Ciceronian form, compare C. F. W. Müller, adnot. crit. II, 2, p. xxxi: *totiens, quotiens quae formae nusquam non sunt in mell. codd.*; and, by way of further illustration, the following may be cited: *quotiens*, Ter. Hec. 60, though *milies*, Eun. 422; ⁵ *quotiens*, Sall. Hist. Frag. 2, 98, 1; *tricies*, 4, 81; *quotiens*, Propert. 1, 3,

¹ So Cicero is reported by Vel. Long. Corp. Gram. VII, 79, 1, as pronouncing *foreisia* instead of *forensia*, *Megalesia* instead of *Megalensia*. Compare, on the whole question, Joh. Schmidt, Zur Gesch. d. indogerm. Vocal. I, 98 ff., Brugmann, Grundriss, I², p. 370 f., and Seelmann, Die Aussprache d. Latein, p. 283 ff. Bennett, Appendix to Latin Grammar, Boston, 1895, p. 20, while skeptical as to this explanation, offers nothing in its stead.

² Cf. Lindsay, p. 409, and Schuchardt, Der Vocal. d. Vulgärlat. II, 515.

³ Yet compare Brambach, p. 269.

⁴ See Mommsen, *Res Gestae Divi Augusti*, 1883, p. 192.

⁵ *Miliens*, Dziatzko, against the mss.

27 ; *decies*, 2, 4, 16 ; *quotiencunque*, Fronto, p. 152 (N.) ; *quinquies*, p. 139 ; Hygin. Grom. ch. 36 sed habemus numerum IIII milia, videmus, *quotiens* habeo : quod est *octies* ; Ael. Lamprid. Commod. 11, 11, *quotiens*, but in 11, 12, *septingenties tricies quinquies*. Martial presents strong contrast in forty examples of *quotiens*, while *decies* occurs nineteen times ; *centies*, seven ; *tricies* and *vicies*, two, etc.¹ That the definite numerals were sometimes even corrected (*sic!*) to the shorter form may be seen from Verg. Ge. 4, 480, where *noviens* of Rom. and the Sched. Vat. has the *n* stricken out in the latter.²

Note.—The frequent confusion of *ti* and *ci* before a vowel in late inscriptions and mss. may be seen in the form *quociens* (*quociencunque*), e. g. in Cato apud Gell. 2, 28, 6 (cod. Vat.), Cic. Planc. 14 (Erfurtensis), Martianus Capella, 3, 302, and Victor Vitensis, Corp. Eccl. p. 83, 9. No inscription or older ms. gives this spelling, which obviously contradicts the derivation, and in the *Notae Tironianae*, according to so clever an interpreter as W. Schmitz,³ there is actual representation of the *t* in the middle stroke of the character used for *quotiens*.

COMPOUNDS.

A final discussion of the relation of the compound to the simple form must follow the citation of examples, yet it was very early suspected that examples of *quotiencunque* would not be comparatively numerous. In some respects the reason for this disparity is obvious at once, partly in the unwieldy length of the compound, especially for poetic use, and partly in the general, indefinite nature which *quotiens* itself could so readily assume. Accordingly prose examples of *quotiencunque* should be far in excess of its use by the poets, and this is precisely what we find to be true. Indeed, with the unimportant exception of two examples in Plautus, it will

¹ Cf. Gilbert in Friedl. Mart. 1, p. 111; Neue II⁸, 336 f.

² Cf. further, Hildebrand on Apul. Met. 2, 3, citing the evidence of older editors.

³ Zeitschrift Pansthenographikon, Band 1, Dresden, 1874, on *quotiens* in the *Notae Bernenses*, and see Tab. 10, 28 and 29 of Schmitz's *Commentarii Not. Tiron.*

Prof. Wölfflin, who furnishes the first reference, makes further interpretation of the character, ALL. xi, p. 395.

be found that the compound is wholly confined to prose. Compare e. g. *Juv.* 3, 318

quotiens te
Roma tuo refici properantem reddet Aquino,
Me quoque ad Helvinam Cererem vestramque Dianam
Converte a Cumis.

and *Fronto*, ad *Amic.* 1, 3 (p. 175 N.): *quotienscunque Romam* venit, in meo contubernio fuit.

Numerous examples of *quotiens* occur where *quotienscunque* could have been used. Occasional attempts have been made by editors to point out such instances. So e. g. *Knoell*, *Eugippius*, *vit. Sanct. Severini*, *Corp. Eccl.* p. 33, 1 *quam, quotiens ripas excessisset, aqua superfluens occupabat*, and again p. 5, 19 *quotiens sermo ortus est*; *Hartel*, *Lucifer Calar.* p. 4, 16 *quotiens murmuravit populus contra deum . . . legisti deum dixisse etc.*; p. 268, 22 *quotiens dicitur a nobis tibi non te potuisse dei unici filii negatorem existere, etc.*; p. 254, 24; 293, 15. Examples might be multiplied, but it is more in point to view this historically and to assign a cause for what might otherwise be thought largely due to individual caprice or inaccuracy. The simple *quotiens* must have been felt to have so general a distributive force that even a better writer than *Eugippius* or *Lucifer* might use it where a modern editor would demand a compound; compare *Cic. ad Att.* 11, 13, 5 *velim, ut soles, facias, quotiensque habebis, cui des ad me litteras, nolim praetermittas* with *ad Fam.* 16, 11, 3 *cura ut valeas litterasque ad me mittas, quotienscunque habebis, cui des*. Here *Cicero* was either uncertain which form to use, a conclusion contradicted by his other examples, or *quotiens* alone was sufficiently indefinite where special emphasis was not intended; just as the simple *totiens* is used throughout the language without a single example of *totienscunque*, whether alone or in correlation with *quotiens* or *quotienscunque*.¹ Other instances of parallel usage are not hard to find. Cf. *Varro*, *R. R.* 3, 10, 7 *quotienscunque*

¹ Obviously *quotienscunque . . . totienscunque* would have been too clumsy. *Lewis* and *Short* cite *taliscunque* as $\delta\pi.$ $\epsilon\imath\pi.$, *Auct. Priap.* 16, but *quale* not *qualecunque* is used with it. Cf. *Wölff.*, *Die Gemination im Lateinischen*, *Sitzungsberichte d. Bayr. Akad. d. Wissensch.* 1882, p. 463.

sumpserunt, locus solet purgari and Petron. ch. 90 *quotiens theatrum . . . intravi*, hac me adventicia excipere frequentia solet; Valer. Max. 3, 6, 4 C. Duellius . . . *quotienscunque epulatus erat . . . domum reverti solitus est* and Epit. Par., *quotiens p. e. . . deducebatur*; Celsus 6, 6, 16 *quotienscunque non adicio . . . aquam intellegi volo* and id. 5, 19, 24 *quae quotiens adiciuntur cerussae vel spumae argenti, scire licet, etc.*; 7, 12, 1 ad fin. *quotienscunque dente exempto radix relicta est . . . eximenda est* and 6, 15 ad med. *quotiens autem medicamentum inicitur, . . . os eluendum est*; 8, 10, 1 ad med. *quotienscunque autem solvit membrum, calida aqua fovendum est* and 8, 10, 2 ad fin. *quotiens solutae sunt, fractura manu continenda*; Cyprian, Corp. Eccl. p. 430, 18 *ut quotienscunque inimicus accesserit . . . clausum adversum se pectus inveniat* and id. p. 430, 19 *ut quotiens adire temptaverit, clausum, etc.*; Ps.-Cypr. p. 30, 20 *Sic quotienscunque . . . distenta imbribus frumenta turgescunt, fecundae messes coguntur aestate* and p. 31, 2 *Sic quotiens ferro vitis absciditur, erumpentibus pampinis melius uva vestitur*; August. Civ. Dei 11, 31 ad med. *quotienscunque ceciderit, non peribit* and Sen. Epp. 2, 1, 2 *quotiens cecidit, contumacior resurrexit*; Serv. ad Ecl. 1, 36 *vocativus Graecus est, qui brevis est, quotienscunque nominativus 'is' terminatur* and id. *Æn. 1, 108 genetivus enim pluralis quotiens in 'ium' exit, accusativum pluralem in 'is' mittit*; *Æn. 1, 9* est figura hypallage, *quae fit quotienscunque per contrarium verba intelleguntur* and *Æn. 1, 23 antonomasia est, non epitheton*; *quae fit quotiens pro proprio nomine ponitur quod potest esse cum proprio nomine*; *Æn. 1, 73* est tropus systole, *qui fit quotienscunque longa corripitur syllaba, etc.* and *1, 208 pleonasmos est, qui fit quotiens adduntur superflua*; *Æn. 1, 77 figura est litotes, quae fit quotienscunque minus dicimus et plus significamus* and *1, 435 est translatio, quae fit quotiens vel deest verborum proprietas, vel vitatur iteratio*; cf. further *Æn. 1, 209; 228; 251; 3, 384*. In the last examples may be seen the cause already referred to, for the simple relative with a present indicative in definitions, general statements and conditions comes to be so extensively used that in the later literature *quotienscunque* is overshadowed and practically supplanted. See Part III for statistics.

To give a pronoun or a pronominal adverb a general meaning

the earlier language doubled the simple form.¹ So *quis* gives *quisquis* (archaic *quirquir*, Varro, L.L. 7, 2, 8) and similarly we have *utut*, *ubiubi*, *undeunde*, *quotquot* (though not early), *quantus-quantus*, *qualisqualis*. *Qualiterqualiter* is cited for the Jurists, Digest. IV, 4, 7, § 1; IX, 2, 7, § 1; XXVI, 7, 5, § 10,² but is rare, if it occurs at all, elsewhere on account of aversion to doubling a word of three syllables. *Quotiensquotiens*, therefore, was never formed. "Am meistens," Prof. Wölfflin states, I.I. p. 449, "hat sich die Sprache gegen die Verdoppelung der mehrsilbigen Pronominalformen gesträubt, . . . so sehen wir, dass die lateinische Sprache mit Ausnahme zweier oder dreier Casus sich der geminierten Formen zu erwehren oder deren Weiterbildung zu stören gesucht hat, was natürlich nur möglich war, wenn sie dafür eine bessere und deutlichere Ersatzbildung bieten konnte. Eine solche fand sie in *cunque*, in welchem *cum* = *quom* temporal in Sinne von 'wann, jedesmal wann, immer' zu verstehen ist; also *quicunque* = *wer immer*. In *que* aber erkennen wir denselben wiederholten, nur abgeschwächten und unreflectierten Pronominalstamm." Instead then of the double forms we have *utcunque*, *ubicunque*, *undecunque*, *quotcunque* (as old as *Catull. 64, 280), *quantuscunque*, *qualiscunque*; cf. also *quisque* (= *quisquis*) and *quandoque* (= *quandocunque*). *Quandoque* in this sense is found as early as the Tabb. XII, though in general examples are comparatively rare.³ A formulaic example is found in Cic. Caecin. 54 *quandoque te in iure conspicio*, but this is weakened by the parallel passage, Mur. 26 *quando te in iure conspicio*. A clear example, however, is de Re Pub. 6, 22, 24; and aside from the poetic passages Hor. C. 4, 1, 17; 2, 34; A.P. 359,⁴ the same abbreviation may be found in Livy 1, 31, 4; 29, 10, 5; 39, 24, 1; Col. 2, 10, 6; 7, 4, 7; 11, 3, 22; Juv. 2, 82; 5, 172; 14, 51; Lactant. Inst. p. 235, 14 (Brandt), (cf. *quando-cunque* p. 235, 6); Orosius p. 152, 1 (Zang.) (*quandocunque* p. 366, 1).

It is evidently after the analogy of *quandoque* that *quotiensque* (= *quotiencunque*), cited below, was formed. This compound

¹ Wölfflin, Gemination, p. 422 ff., ALL. I.1.

² Dirksen, Man. Latinitatis Fontium Juris Civilis, 797.

³ Schmalz, Lat. Synt.³ § 305.

⁴ *Quandocunque* occurs, Epp. 1, 14, 17; 16, 58.

has scant recognition in the lexicons. The citations are limited to Col. 6, 17, 9 (Quidam legunt—Forcell.): *sed quotiensque mel aliusve succus remediis adhibetur*. No earlier example occurs, since the Augustan writers employ *quotiensque* invariably in the sense of *et quotiens*. Cf. Ovid, A. A. 2, 327

Multa vove, sed cuncta palam. *quotiensque* libebit,
Quae referas illi somnia laeta vide.

Met. 3, 495

Quae tamen ut vidit, quamvis irata memorque,
Indoluit, *quotiensque* puer miserabilis 'Eheu !'
Dixerat, haec resonis iterabat vocibus, Eheu.

Met. 4, 588 ; 10, 164 ; Amor. 2, 8, 27 ; Manil. 1, 513 ; Cic. Cat. 3, 5, 11 ; ad Att. 11, 13, 5 ; and later in Valer. Flacc. 8, 364 ; Sil. Ital. 12, 145 ; Curt. 4, 10, 6 ; Plin. Pan. 88 ; Gell. 14, 7, 4.

The apparatus criticus of Schneider's edition justifies other examples of *quotiensque* in Columella, though neither Schneider nor Gesner reads this form.¹ Cf. 2, 4, 10 *Paulum tamen, quotiensque* (I. B. Br., *quotiesque*, ex Pol. excerpt.) *iterabitur . . . obliquum agi sulcum oportebit* ; 12, 51, 2 *idque fieri debebit, quotiensque* (I. B. Br. R.) ; 52, 16 *eamque sufftionem semper faciendam iudicant, quotiensque* (Br.) *vel nova vel vetera vasa curantur*.²

Suetonius and Ulpian also furnish examples: cf. Aug. 37 *excogitavit . . . triumviratum . . . recognoscendi turmas equitum, quotiensque opus esset*, and Calig. 7 *cuius effigiem . . . in cubiculo positam, quotiensque introiret, exosculabatur*. Two examples in the Digest have been recognized by Kriegel and Mommsen. In Ulp. Dig. VII, 4, 3 *praef. quotiensque capite minutus erit, quoties quis* was read before Kriegel ; ibid. XLIII, 8, 2, 10 *quotiensque aliquid in publico fieri permittitur* is due to Mommsen, since *quotienscunque* is read by Kriegel following the corrector of the codex Florentinus. Silvia, Peregrin. 50 *nam consuetudo talis erat in illo tempore, ut palatia, quotiensque*

¹ The promised critical edition of Lundström has not, unfortunately, been seen.

² Observe that Schneider in 2, 10, 16 ; 7, 4, 7 ; 11, 3, 22, accepts the better known *quandoque* on the same authority.

fabricabantur, semper in editioribus locis fierent is a more certain example, though *quotienscunque* is read by Cholodniak, and Geyer has questioned the reading.¹ *Quotiensque* with good ms. authority, especially in late Latin, has doubtless in many cases been quietly corrected (!) by an editor unfamiliar with the abbreviated compound. So in Ruricius, p. 382, 13, Engelbrecht reads *quotienscunque* *sanctos viros . . . aerumnarum mole depressi coguntur expetere* following the *lectio vulgata*, while the Codex Sangallensis (Sc. IX) preserves the correct *quotiensque*.² Cf. similarly Ammianus Marc. 16, 10, 18 *ut quotienscunque* (*quotiensque*, Vat.) *concepisset, immaturum abiceret partum*.

Along with the method of composition already given, *-vis* and *-libet* were used to give similar effect, as in *quivis*,³ *quilibet*, *undelibet*, *quotlibet*, etc. This formation, however, is not so freely used, for while *quilibet* is common from Plaut. on, *quotlibet* is cited first from Hygin. Astron. 1, 6,⁴ and *quandolibet* (= *quandoque* = *ali-quando*) occurs first in Lactant. Opific. Dei p. 15, 20 (Brandt) *necesse est igitur ut mortem recipiat quandolibet, quoniam corporalis est*. Cf. ibid. p. 16, 18 *qui quandoque moriturus est* and Inst. p. 151, 5. *Quotienslibet* is also rare and is not cited by Georges earlier than Boeth. Mus. 1, 4 (p. 192, 2 Fried.) where it is used as an indefinite: *cum maior numerus habet in se minorem vel bis vel ter vel quotienslibet*. But other examples not cited by Georges occur in Boeth., e. g. Arith. 1, 14 (p. 31, 5 Fried.) *Metitur numerus numerum, quotiens vel semel vel bis vel tertio vel quotienslibet numerus ad numerum comparatus . . . ad comparati numeri terminum usque pervenerit*; 1, 29 (p. 61, 4) *aut duplum aut triplum aut quadruplum aut quotienslibet*; and the form is not only much earlier, but it occurs as a relative, potentially at least, in Celsus 4, 23 *non quotienslibet desidere, sed quotiens necesse est*. Cf. again Rusticius, contra Acephalos, Patrol. LXVII, Col. 1190 (Migne) idem

¹ Cf. Krit. Bemerkungen z. S. Silviae Peregrin. (St. Anna Program), Augsburg, 1890, p. 34: *quotiensque* (lies *quotienscunque* nach S. 67, 6: *quotienscunque*).

² Also read in the text of Krusch, Mon. Ger. Hist. VIII, Berol. 1887.

³ Even *quiviscunque*, Lucret. 3, 388; Mart. 14, 2, 1. Similarly *quisquislibet* of late Latin, cf. Salv. adv. Avar. 3, 18; Avitus, Mon. Ger. p. 28, 13 (Peip.); 39, 10.

⁴ Cited by Lewis and Short as $\delta\pi.$ $\epsilon\iota\rho$, but cf. Boeth. Arith. 1, 31 (p. 65, 5 Fried.); 2, 2 (p. 80, 9); 2, 43 (p. 140, 20); Mus. 2, 8 (p. 236, 7; 8); *passim*.

namque est, *quotienslibet* quis convertat verboitate sermones, and the indefinite use, Ammian. Marc. 21, 5, 3 *vigore communi Romanis agminibus quotienslibet Rhenum pervium feci*. The combination *quotiensque* (= *et quotiens*) *libebit* is found in Ovid, A. A. 2, 327.

In a similar way a *quotiensvis* might be assumed from such combinations as *quotiens velles*, Sen. Controv. 4, praef. 7; *quotiens velis*, Sen. Epp. 6, 3, 9; *quotiens voles*, ibid. 4, 6, 4; de Ben. 4, 7, 1; Vicies septies dices et *quotiens volueris repetes*, Marcell. p. 111, 28 (Helmr.), etc. This form, however, does not occur. *Quandovis* in our analogy is also lacking.

An interesting combination which points to the easy language of every day life is seen in *nescio quotiens*, after the analogy of *nescio quando* (cf. Cic. Philipp. 2, 3), or the earlier and more common *nescio quomodo*. That *nescio quotiens* was of frequent use is shown by its occurrence in the *Notae Tironianae* (Schmitz, Comment. 10, 31) along with *nescio quomodo*. The extant literature oddly enough shows, as far as I have noted, but one example, August. Civ. Dei 12, 18 init. *hominem nescio quibus circuitibus, nescio quotiens revolutum*.

Further comparison with *quando* furnishes the following parallels:

<i>quando</i>	<i>si quando</i>	<i>quando umquam</i> ²	<i>quandocunque</i>
<i>quotiens</i>	<i>si quotiens</i> ¹	<i>quotiens saepe</i> ³	<i>quotiencunque</i>
<i>quandoque</i>	<i>quandolibet</i>	<i>nescio quando</i>	
<i>quotiensque</i>	<i>quotienslibet</i>	<i>nescio quotiens</i>	

MEANING.

The strict meaning of *quotiens*, "how many times," may be seen e. g. in Plaut. Curc. 608 *Dixi tibi . . . : quotiens dicendumst?* In the Nov. Test. it is accordingly used to render *ποσάκις* (Matth. 18, 21; 23, 27; Luc. 13, 24) or *όστακις*, as in the Lord's Supper,

¹ After *si* for *aliquotiens*; but three instances have been noted, Ovid, Trist. 5, 10, 42; Sulp. Sever. p. 131, 5 (Halm); 204, 4. Cf. *nisi quotiens* Serv. ad AEn. 8, 268; Sid. Apoll. 7, 14, 11.

² For emphasis after *si*, but only in Livy, e. g. 6, 42, 12; 8, 4, 6 (Weissenb. ad loc.); 10, 14, 11.

³ Evidently a cross between *quotiens* and its equivalent *quam saepe* (cf. infra). Only one example was noted, Sid. Apoll. 1, 7, 2.

1 Corinth. 11, 25 *quotiencunque* bibetis (όσάκις ἐὰν πίνητε); Apocal. 11, 6 *quotiencunque* voluerint (όσάκις ἐὰν θελήσωσι). Compare Prisc. III (K.) 132, 8 adverbium, interrogativum et relativum *quotiens*, ποσάκις καὶ ὄσάκις.

In the freer sense "how often" the early Latin had already used *quam saepe*, possibly before the formation of *quotiens*. Compare for analogy *quam diu*. *Quam saepe* is found first in Ter. Phorm. 757 *quam saepe forte temere Eveniunt quae non audeas optare*, without comment by Donatus. The Auctor ad Heren. 3, 12, 21 follows with *quam* (quae codd.) *saepe rerum naturae gratia quaedam iure debetur*. Cicero confines his few examples to the Philosophical works and the Letters; cf. Tusc. 2, 41; de Div. 1, 97; 2, 62, and ad Att. 10, 9, 1; ad Fam. 7, 10, 3, where the parallels *quam insulsi* and *quam diligenter* should be noted. Similarly *tam saepe* (= *totiens*, found as early as Plaut. Merc. 33) is parallel with *tam vehementer*, ad Att. 3, 10, 2, though *totiens* et *tam longe* occurs in 4, 16, 7. Compare a similar chance for substitution in *quotiens et quam diu*, Sen. Controv. 4 Praef. 7 and *quam diu et quotiens*, Apul. Apolog. 73. In the orations Cic. shifts to *quam crebro*, Mil. 69; Philipp. 2, 70, as Catull. changes to *ut saepe*, 66, 30. Plautus had used the latter expression once, Capt. 165.

Cæsar, B. C. 3, 72, 4 *quam parvulae saepe causae magna detrimenta intulissent* may fairly be cited since the *quam saepe* and *parvulae causae* are separated by *traiectio*, as is the phrase in Cic. de Div. 2, 62.

In the Augustan age examples are still to be cited: Tibull. 1, 6, 21; 8, 53; Ovid, Am. 1, 14, 47. Livy 34, 20, 6 *memores, quam saepe in agro eorum impune persultassent, quotiens ipsos signis collatis fudissent* is noteworthy especially since *quam saepe* precedes. Cf. further Quintil. 6, 3, 77 *apparet, inquit, quam saepe accendatis* (quoting Augustus); again in Juv. 9, 73, and in late Latin Boeth. Mus. 1, 1 (p. 184, 7 Fried.) An interesting blending of *quotiens* and *quam saepe* through the carelessness of epistolary style is seen in Sid. Apoll. Epp. 1, 7, 2 *O quotiens saepe ipse se adversa perpessum gloriabatur!*

A complete list of *quam saepe* is not offered, but a large number of representative authors of various periods has been examined,

and the search shows that only sporadic examples of substitution occur from Plautus on, even as late as Boethius, while their limited number affords no absolute clue to their sphere. *Quotiens* and *totiens* practically displaced these combinations early in the language, as examples from Plautus show, and, aside from the possibilities in the case, the "Konkurrenz" is not striking.

Neither *quotiens* nor *quotiencunque* per se necessarily expresses a large number of times. Cf. for example Alfen. Var. Digest. xxxiii, 1, 22 *Filiae meae, quotiencunque vidua erit, in annos singulos centum heres meus dato.* Accordingly, it is unnecessary with Wex¹ and Peerlkamp² to demand *si quando* in Tac. Agric. 1 *clarorum virorum facta moresque posteris tradere, antiquitus usitatum, ne nostris quidem temporibus aetas omisit, quotiens magna aliqua ac nobilis virtus vicit ac supergressa est ignorantiam recti et invidiam.* Peerlkamp, following Wex, remarks: *virtus tam rara postulabat, ni fallor, si quando. Restringe significationem adverbii quotiens, semper maiorem numerum indicat quam in tempora praesertim Neronis et Domitiani cadit.* But there are in reality two apodoses in the first clause, the early practice (*antiquitus usitatum*) and its survival (*ne nostris quidem temporibus, etc.*), to each of which in the author's thought *quotiens* belongs. A correct interpretation is given by Pohlmann,³ though disputed by Planck.⁴

Quotiens expresses only iteration, not frequency, unless the context makes these two synonymous. Cf. Marcell. p. 376, 17 (Helmr.) *et die bis aut ter vel quotiens siccari cooperit mutanda erit; Plin. Epp. 6, 2, 7 equidem quotiens iudico, quod vel saepius facio, quam dico, quantum quis plurimum postulat aquae do.* Similarly Cic. ad Fam. 6, 5, 1 *quotiencunque filium tuum video (video autem fere quotidie); ibid. 13, 41, 1 tum Pompeius, quotiencunque me videt (videt autem saepe),* while in 13, 69, 1 *Apud eum ego sic Ephesi fui, quotiencunque fui, tamquam domi meae even the opposite of frequency seems to be denoted.*

The idea of frequency may be added by the use of a frequenta-

¹ *Agricola, Brunsvigae, 1852, Prolegom.* p. 164.

² *Agricola, 1864, ad loc.*

³ *Annotations in Corn. Taciti Agricolam, Gottingae, 1871, p. 18.*

⁴ *Zur Erklärung d. Tac. Agrik.* 1874, p. 7.

tive verb, but classical examples are wanting and in the later ones the frequentative force has often faded. Cf. Tac. Ann. 6, 21, 1 Quotiens super tali negotio consultaret, edita domus parte . . . utebatur ; 13, 18, 16 quotiens ipse illuc ventitaret ; Ammian. Marc. 20, 11, 9 ; Cypr. Gall. Exod. 769 ; 991 ; Ennod. C. 2, 121, 1.

That *quotiens* should often be found where *cum*, *quando*, *ubi*, *utcunque*, etc., could be used and v. v. was to be expected in a live language. Compare Paulus, Digest. 1, 5, 7 qui in utero est . . . *quotiens* (= *cum*, *quando*) de commodis ipsius partus quaeritur with id. L, 16, 231 tunc verum est, *cum* de ipsius iure quaeritur. Often these are parallel in a single passage to give variety. Cf. Valer. Flacc. 6, 683

At quotiens vis dura ducum densique repente
Aesoniden pressere viri cumque omnis in unum
imber iit, totiens saxis pulsatur et hastis ;

Plin. N. H. 18, 323 quotiens at occidente sole cernetur . . . crescens erit . . . , cum vero occidente sole orietur et adverso . . . tum erit plenilunium ; Ulp. Digest. 1, 16, 38 duo genera autem sunt ostentorum : unum, quotiens quid contra naturam nascitur ; alterum, cum quid prodigiosum videtur ; Diom. 1 (K.) 309, 1 quintus, quotiens in o exeunt femina (cf. with *tertius*, *cum*, *supra*) ; Serv. on *Æn.* 9, 192 poscere est secundum Varronem quotiens aliquid pro merito nostro depositimus, petere vero est cum aliquid humiliter et cum precibus postulamus. In Marcell. p. 311, 22 (Helmr.) hoc . . . remedium . . . ad alios translatum, *cum* volueris et quotiens volueris, proderit each word has its proper force.

On the other hand, compare e. g. Porph. on Hor. Epod. 17, 52 *utcunque autem 'quotiencunque' significat* ; Serv. *Æn.* 1, 412 figura est *tmesis*, quae fit *cum* *seco* uno sermone aliquid interponimus (*Æn.* 1, 77 figura est *litotes*, quae fit *quotiencunque*, etc., *Æn.* 1, 435 est *translatio*, quae fit *quotiens*, etc.); and compare further Serv. *Æn.* 1, 119 *cum* *provinciam dicimus* . . . et *principale* est *nomen*, *brevis* est 'Tro,' *quando* autem non est *principale* et *derivatio* est, *longa* est 'Tro' with *ibid.* 3, 384 *ut quotiencunque Sicilia significatur*, *Trinacria totum per 'r'* dicatur, *quotiens Sicula*, *per unam 'r.'* In 1, 41 *cum* and *quotiens* are again

parallel: media producitur syllaba, sed cum opus est corripitur
hac excusatione: nam *quotiens* vocalem longam vocalis sequitur,
ei vires detrahit.

Note.—The phrase *cum opus erit* (*fuerit*) is especially common in the directions of Marcell. Cf. p. 288, 27 (Helmr.); 362, 17; 364, 5; 17; 369, 13; 375, 22; 376, 36; 379, 31, though *quotiens opus fuerit* occurs p. 149, 26; 281, 18–19 (cf. 281, 14; q. *fuerit necessarium*). The phrase is frequent in other writers, cf. q. *opus est*, Ovid, A. A. 1, 430; 3, 641; Luc. 6, 560; Sen. de Ira 1, 9, 1; de Ben. 2, 34, 2; Frontin. Aq. 14 (cf. q. *necesse est* Sen. Phoeniss. 493); q. *opus fuerit*, Curt. 10, 6, 15; q. o. sit, Plin. N. H. 17, 129; 34, 122; q. o. esset, Sueton. Galba 10; *quotienscunque opus erit*, Cato, Agri Cult. 151, 4; Cic. de Orat. 3, 123; *quotienscunque opus fuerit*, Vitruv. 5, 12, 4; *quotiensque opus esset*, Sueton. Aug. 37.

In the Jurists Kalb¹ notes that for a certain period, especially in Africanus, Gaius and Marcellus, who belong to the reigns of Antoninus Pius and Marcus Aurelius, *quotiens* is given up and *cum* and other substitutes are used. Cf. for example Gaius, Inst. 4, 3 in *rem actio est, cum . . . rem intendimus nostram esse* with Ulp. Digest. II, 14, 7, 8 (*pacta*) in *rem sunt, quotiens generaliter paciscor ne petam*. Gaius, however, shows two examples 1, 162; 4, 2, though the text is uncertain in the latter. Kalb offers no explanation (deren Grund wir nicht finden konnten), but as the later Jurists make frequent use of *quotiens* for *si* and *cum*, it is evident that they were under the influence of the same loose usage cited above, while Gaius writing his own lectures made nicer distinction.²

AUTHORS EXAMINED.³

Plautus, Ennius, Terence, Cato, Lucilius, Auct. ad Heren., Lucretius, Catullus, Caesar, Hirtius, Nepos, Cicero, Publilius Syrus, Sal-

¹ Roms Juristen nach ihrer Sprache dargestellt, Leipzig. 1890, p. 31.

² Cf. the suggestion of Prof. Wölff., abstract, p. 398.

³ Editions are regularly indicated in the citations that are made by page and line, and in other cases where pertinent variants are found. The Teubner texts are usually taken as the basis. The grammarians are naturally cited from Keil's Corpus Grammaticorum and patristic writers from the Corpus Vindobonense, unless otherwise indicated.

lust, Varro, Vergil, Tibullus, Propertius, Livy, Hyginus, Vitruvius, Horace (Porph.), Auct. Bell. Afr., Manilius, Seneca Rhetor, Ovid, Valerius Maximus (Epit. Par.), Vell. Paterculus, Phaedrus, Mela, Columella, Curtius, Celsus, Scribonius Largus, Petronius, Calp. Siculus, Nemesianus, Persius, Probus, Lucan, Seneca Phil., Valer. Flaccus, Plin. Mai., Quintilian, Pseud.-Quintil., Statius, Hygin. Grom., Caper, Vel. Longus, Silius Italicus, Frontinus, Martial, Plin. Min., Tacitus, Juvenal, Florus, Terent. Scaurus, Justinus, Suetonius, Apuleius, Fronto, Gellius, Gaius, Min. Felix, Ampelius, Licinianus, Tertullian (Vol. I Reiff.-Wiss.), Censorinus, Comedianus, Cyprian, Solinus, Jul. Valerius, Terent. Maurus, Arnobius, Plotius, Publil. Optatianus, Palladius, Atil. Fortunatianus, Scriptores Hist. Aug., Lactantius, Juvencus, Firm. Maternus, Plin. (Medicus), Mar. Victorinus, Aurel. Victor, Obsequens, Charisius, Diomedes, Eutropius, Dictys Cretensis, Vegetius, Ausonius, St. Silvia, Auctor Queroli, Prudentius, Amm. Marcellinus, Macrobius, Marcellus Empir., Orosius, Rufinus, Symmachus, Hieronymus, Mall. Theodorus, Servius (Commentaries on Verg.), Claud. Claudianus, Pelagonius, Sulpicius Severus, Mart. Capella, Augustinus (C. D. only), Salvianus, Cassius Felix, Sedulius, Claud. Mamertus, Faustus Reiensis, Ruricius, Lucifer Cal., Sid. Apollinaris, Agroecius, Victor Vitensis, Dares Phrygius, Priscian, Eugippius (Vit. S. Sever.), Boethius, Ennodius, Fulgentius, Digesta Justiniani, Jordanis, Cyprian. Gall., Cassiodor(i)us, Gregory of Tours.

PART II.

CITATION OF EXAMPLES.¹

QUOTIENS.

A. EXCLAMATORY: INDICATIVE, *Present*—**CIC.** ad Att. 7, 26, 1; **TIBULL.** 2, 3, 17; **PROPERT.** 1, 10, 4; 18, 21; **OVID**, A. A. 2, 447; 567; **Trist.** 3, 12, 25; **SEN.** Herc. O. 93; **SIL. ITAL.** 13, 667; **MART.** 10, 51, 15; **CLAUDIAN.** de Rapt. Proserp. 3, 126; 127; **ENNOD.** p. 15, 19 (Hartel).—*Imperfect*—**TER.** Hec. 60; **SEN.** Herc. O. 1914; **SIL. ITAL.** 6, 584; **SID.** **APOLL.** Epp. 1, 7, 2.—*Future*—**PROPERT.** 1, 5, 13; **SEN.** Controv. 9, 5, 1; **OVID**, Her. 15, 81; **SIL. ITAL.** 13, 866; **MART.** 11, 16, 5; **CLAUDIAN.** de Nupt. Honor. 4, 14; de Consul. Stil. 2, 398; 404.—*Perfect*—**CATO**, in Sulpic. p. 62, 1 (Jordan); **CIC.** Mil. 5, 12; 7, 20; 14, 38; 15, 41; Cat. 1, 6, 15 (bis); 16 (bis); Phil. 2, 18, 45 (bis); Marc. 6, 16; Dom. 23, 59; Font. 7, 16; Arch. 8, 18 (ter); Tusc. 1, 89; Div. 1, 97; Cat. Mai. 49 (bis); **VERG.** Ecl. 3, 72; Ge. 1, 471; Ciris 81; 82; **TIBULL.** 1, 3, 19; 9, 17; 41; 2, 3, 19; 6, 13; **PROPERT.** 3, 31, 11; 4, 14, 13; 15; 5, 7, 17; **LIVY** 7, 29, 2; 39, 16, 8; 40, 8, 11; **SEN.** Controv. 9, 6, 20; **OVID**, Her. 5, 49; 51; 9, 79; 15, 135; 137; 16, 81 (bis); Am. 1, 13, 27; 29; 2, 19, 11; 13; 3, 1, 53; A. A. 1, 313; 321; 2, 125; 3, 481; Nux 160; 161; Met. 2, 489; 491; 3, 375; 427; 428; 10, 661; 14, 643; 15, 490; 492; **Trist.** 1, 3, 51; 53; ex Pont. 1, 1, 7; 1, 9, 21; 23; 4, 1, 9; 11; **VALER. MAX.** 9, 3, 5; **CURT.** 10, 5, 35 (bis); **CALP. SIC.** Ecl. 7, 69; **LUC.** 5, 615; **SEN.** Epp. 10, 2, 14 (bis); de Rem. Fort. 16, 5; Herc. F. 21; Herc. O. 1912; **VALER. FLACC.** 1, 447; 2, 53; 4,

¹ Authors are arranged in an approximately chronological order, with certain exceptions (e. g. the Jurists) for convenience in grouping. Convenience is followed also in designating but few pseudos.

Tenses are contemporary unless otherwise indicated in the classification.

378 ; **PSEUD.-QUINTIL.** p. 281, 12 (Ritter); 352, 16 ; **STAT.** *Silv.* 1, 2, 93 ; 5, 5, 38 ; *Theb.* 5, 615 ; **SIL. ITAL.** 7, 152 ; **MART.** 9, 84, 7 ; 14, 115, 2 ; 119, 2 ; **PLIN.** *Pan.* 15 (bis) ; **SUETON.** *de Vir. Ill.* p. 44, 6 (Reiff.) ; **FLAV. VOPISC.** *Prob.* 12, 6 ; **PRUD.** *Psych.* 899 (bis) ; **CLAUDIAN.** in *Eutrop.* 1, 35 ; *Epith. de Nupt. Honor.* 8¹ ; *Pan. Manl. Theod.* 54 ; *de Consul. Stil.* 1, 122 ; 233 ; 3, 184 ; 185 ; *de Rapt. Proserp.* 1, 192 ; 193 ; **AUGUST.** *Civ. Dei* 3, 18 init. ; 19 init. ; **SALVIAN.** p. 39, 11 (Pauly) ; **SID. APOLL.** *Carm.* 23, 233 ; **ENNOD.** *Carm.* 1, 8, 39 ; 41 ; 2, 140, 1 ; **BOETH.** *Consol.* 1, 4, 29 (p. 11, 29 Peip.) ; 31 ; 32 ; **GREG. TUR.** *Hist. Franc.* 5 prol. init.

INFINITIVE, Perfect—**LIVY** 25, 16, 12 ; 30, 21, 7 ; **TAC.** *Ann.* 3, 34, 27.

B. **INTERROGATIVE** : **INDICATIVE, Present**—**PLAUT.** *Amph.* 619 ; *Cure.* 609 ; *Most.* 948 ; **SERV. SULP.** apud **CIC.** *ad Fam.* 4, 5, 3 ; **LIVY** 34, 12, 8 ; **SEN.** *Controv.* 10, 4, 22 ; **OVID.** *Trist.* 5, 6, 25 ; **LUC.** 8, 408 ; **SEN.** *Dial.* 10, 5, 1 ; *Nat. Quaest.* 3, 17, 2 ; **STAT.** *Theb.* 2, 337 ; **HYGIN. GROM.** 36 ; **TERTULL.** p. 395, 1 (Reiff.-Wiss. 1) ; 3 ; **AUSON.** p. 120, 43 (Peiper).—**Imperfect**—**VARRO**, *Menipp.* 186 (Buech.) ; **SEN.** *Herc. O.* 212.—**Future**—**CIC.** *Verr.* 2, 59, 145 ; **HOR.** *Carm.* 1, 5, 5 ; **OVID**, *Her.* 16, 217.—**Perfect**—**PLAUT.** *Asin.* 522 ; *Men.* 784 ; 788 ; *Mil. Glor.* 1057 ; **CIC.** *ad Att.* 12, 6, 2 ; **MANIL.** 1, 509 ; **SEN.** *Controv.* 2, 7, 5 (bis) ; **SEN.** *Epp.* 14, 3, 9 (quater) ; 19, 1, 3 (bis) ; **MART.** 11, 43, 3 ; **FRONTO**, *ad Ver. Imp.* 2, 8 ; **CYPR.** p. 44, 15 (Hartel) ; *App.* 120, 17 ; *Carm.* 6, 278 ; 279 ; **ARNOB.** p. 271, 16 (Reiff.) ; **AMM. MARC.** 20, 5, 4 ; **SYM.** *Epp.* 10, 9, 6 ; **ENNOD.** p. 9, 22 ; 310, 8 ; 9 ; 364, 6 ; 7 ; 372, 2 ; 3 ; 22 ; 395, 8 ; 426, 26 ; 27 ; 470, 21 ; 22 ; 26 ; 479, 27 ; 491, 13 ; 17.—**Pluperfect**—**ENNOD.** p. 480, 1.

SUBJUNCTIVE, Present—**CIC.** *Div. in Caecil.* 14, 45 ; **LIVY** 5, 52, 9 ; **SEN.** *Controv.* 7, 8, 8 ; **OVID**, *Her.* 18, 31 ; **CELS.** 2, 14 fin. ; **AUCT. AETNAE** 88 ; **PLIN.** *Nat. Hist.* 22, 107 ; **STAT.** *Theb.* 7, 201 ; **MART.** 9, 35, 7 ; **JUV.** 3, 270 ; **APUL.** *Apol.* 38 ; **TERENT.** *MAUR.* VI (K.) *Met.* 2873 ; **MAR. VICTORIN.** VI (K.) 72, 17 ; **AUSON.** p. 180, 10 (Peiper).—**Imperfect**—**JUL. CAP.** *Opil.*

¹ Parallel with *quam* *saepe* ; cf. Part I, p. 20 f.

Macr. 3, 1.—*Perfect*.—**CATO**, Orig. 4, 1, (bis); **LIVY** 26, 13, 6; 34, 5, 8; 35, 18, 7; 38, 47, 12 (bis); **MANIL.** 1, 513; **SEN.** Controv. 2, 1, 8; **OVID**, Am. 2, 8, 27; 3, 8, 21; Met. 7, 734; 735; **VELL. PATERC.** 2, 42, 2; **SEN.** Dial. 4, 28, 6; 5, 25, 2; **PSEUD.-QUINTIL.** p. 16, 12 (Ritter); **STAT.** Theb. 8, 510; **TAC.** Hist. 4, 58, 9; Ann. 3, 6, 10; **APUL.** Apol. 73; **TERTULL.** p. 61, 4 (Reiff.-Wiss. 1); **TERENT.** **MAUR.** vi (K.) Met. 2668; **JUL. CAP.** Opil. Maer. 1, 4; **ARNOB.** p. 6, 26; **LACT.** p. 589, 2 (Laub.-Brandt 1); 3; **FLAV. VOPISC.** Prob. 6, 1; **MAR. VICTORIN.** vi (K.) 161, 13; **AUCT. QUEROL.** p. 11, 4 (Peiper); **CLAUDIAN.** Cons. Olyb. et Prob. 58; **ENNOD.** p. 364, 2.—*Pluperfect*—Caes. B. G. 1, 43, 7; B. C. 3, 72, 4; **CIC.** Cat. 3, 5, 11; **SALL.** Hist. Fragg. 3, 48, 1 (Maur.); **LIVY** 23, 15, 12; 34, 20, 6; 35, 33, 4; **PHAED.** App. 9, 27, 6; **JUSTIN.** 13, 1, 3; **TERTULL.** p. 61, 16 (Reiff.-Wiss. 1).
INFINITIVE, *Perfect*—**LIVY** 33, 12, 8.

C. RELATIVE: INDICATIVE, *Present*—**PLAUT.** Epid. 175; Men. 114; Truec. 196; **LUCIL.** 9, 34 (M. = 911 Baehr.); **CIC.** Orat. 111; Fin. 5, 63; **VERG.** Æn. 4, 351; 352; **VITRUV.** 5, 8, 2; **HOR.** Carm. 4, 2, 26; Epp. 1, 18, 104; 2, 1, 55; (**PORPH.** Sat. 2, 1, 22; Epp. 1, 18, 104); **MANIL.** 1, 700; **SEN.** Controv. 1, 2, 15; 2, 5, 11; 3, 5 fin.; **OVID**, Her. 12, 190; 18, 180; 19, 190; A. A. 1, 430; 2, 613; 3, 641; Met. 4, 587; 6, 481; Fast. 1, 573; Trist. 1, 7, 9; 2, 1, 33; 4, 7, 7; ex Pont. 1, 2, 122; 2, 1, 13; 9, 16; 3, 1, 61; **COL.** 4, 32, 5; 12, 12, 1; **CELS.** 1, 9 init.; 2, 16 fin.; 2, 17 init.; 4, 26 fin.; 31 med.; 5, 19, 24; 26, 24; 6, 15 med.; 18, 2 fin.; 7, 2 med.; **CALP. SIC.** 2, 85; 5, 53; 7, 21; **Luc.** 1, 256; 3, 469; 549; 6, 560; 9, 404; **SEN.** Epp. 2, 7, 1; 4, 5, 1; 6, 4, 8; 7, 3, 17; 13, 2, 4; 18, 2, 8; 5, 24; 20, 5, 14; Dial 1, 4, 5; 3, 9, 1; de Clem. 1, 12, 1; de Ben. 2, 10, 4; 31, 2; 34, 2; 7, 23, 1; Nat. Quaest. 1, 5, 6; 12, 1; 2, 58, 1; 3 praef. 4; 3, 30, 3; 6, 6, 4; 9, 3; **VALER. FLACC.** 8, 364; **PLIN.** Nat. Hist. 17, 104; 18, 277; 22, 123; **QUINTIL.** Inst. Orat. 1, 6, 29; 2, 16, 10; 3, 6, 27; 95; 4, 1, 46; 2, 41; 5, 26; 6, 2, 14; 7, 8, 7; 8, 3, 56; 82; 5, 21; 6, 59; 9, 2, 7; 27; 34; 3, 75; 76; 4, 40; 67; 10, 3, 27; 11, 3, 102; 12, 1, 29; 10, 27; 29; **PSEUD.-QUINT.** p. 15, 18 (Ritter); 40, 7; 75, 13; 89, 18; 90, 24; 26; 124, 12; 141, 16; 17; 210, 17; 228, 8; 259, 7; 326, 5; 358, 28; **STAT.** Silv. 3 praef.; 2, 37; Theb.

6, 11 ; 685 ; **HYGIN.** **GROM.** 2 ; 40 ; 43 ; 52 ; **VEL.** **LONG.** VII (K.) 60, 17 ; 63, 6 ; 66, 4 ; 72, 2 ; 81, 7 ; **SIL.** **ITAL.** 1, 266 ; 3, 410 ; 12, 145 ; **FRONTIN.** **Strat.** 1, 11, 17 ; **Aq.** 11 ; 14 ; 15 ; 28 ; 35 (bis)¹ ; 112 (bis) ; **MART.** 1, 117, 1 ; 2, 14, 2 ; 5, 18, 9 ; 50, 1 ; 52, 3 ; 6, 36, 2 ; 93, 8 ; 7, 35, 2 ; 8, 55, 2 ; 76, 4 ; 10, 80, 1 ; 11, 7, 13 ; 99, 1 ; 102, 5 ; 12, 56, 3 ; 13, 70, 1 ; 101, 2 ; **PLIN.** **Epp.** 1, 22, 2 ; 6, 2, 7 ; 9, 36, 2 ; **TAC.** **Dial.** 23, 23 ; 24 ; **Agric.** 30, 1 ; **Germ.** 15, 1 ; **Hist.** 1, 37, 10 ; **Ann.** 4, 1, 19 ; 6, 11, 16 ; 42, 4 ; **JUV.** 2, 2 ; 156 ; 3, 306 ; 5, 28 ; 6, 67 ; 180 ; 194 ; 535 ; 647 ; 7, 179 ; 9, 51 ; 111 ; 14, 21 ; **TERENT.** **SCAUR.** VII (K.) 16, 1 ; 23, 6 ; 29, 4 ; 6 ; 15 ; **SUETON.** **de Vir.** **Ill.** p. 118, 5 (Reiff.) ; 140, 14 ; 22 ; 141, 3 ; **Pratum** 211, 11 ; **GAIUS** 4, 2 ; **MIN.** **FEL.** p. 40, 8 (Halm) ; **TERTULL.** p. 66, 12 (R.-W. 1) ; 107, 8 ; 10 ; 221, 15 ; **CYPR.** p. 801, 18 ; **App.** p. 31, 2 ; 33, 6 ; 35, 15 ; 39, 1 ; 239, 9 ; **SOLIN.** p. 221, 15 (Mommsen.) ; 16 ; **JUL.** **VALER.** **Ep.** **Alex.** **ad Dind.** p. 170, 9 (Kuebler) ; **TERENT.** **MAUR.** VI (K.) Lit. 142 ; 172 ; 220 ; **Syl.** 792 ; 1011 ; 1128 ; 1207 ; 1273 ; **Met.** 1523 ; 1840 ; 1849 ; 1992 ; 2749 ; **PALLAD.** 1, 28, 2 ; 3, 25, 22 ; 4, 9, 8 ; 10, 10, 3 ; **LACT.** p. 140, 6 (L.-B. 1) ; 170, 18 ; 207, 7 ; 496, 21 ; 532, 12 ; 693, 2 ; **JUVENC.** 3, 224 ; **MAR.** **VICTORIN.** VI (K.) 10, 10 ; 15, 8 ; 17, 9 ; 19, 6 ; 23, 7 ; 33, 8 ; 61, 6 ; 83, 12 ; 107, 20 ; 21 (bis) ; 163, 11 ; 12 ; **Ars** 195, 21 ; 22 ; 23 ; 199, 14 ; 202, 14 ; 204, 4 ; 5 ; **de Rat.** **Met.** **Com.** 217, 17 ; **CHARIS.** I (K.) 8, 18 (bis) ; 85, 13 ; 173, 9 ; 227, 3 ; 10 ; 12 ; 30 ; 228, 1 ; 9 ; 16 (bis) ; 22 ; 233, 4 ; 10 ; 11 ; 234, 3 ; 235, 25 ; 236, 1 ; **DIOM.** I (K.) 308, 31 ; 33 ; 35 ; 309, 1 ; 27 ; 322, 11 ; 372, 7 ; 9 ; 25 (bis) ; 378, 8 ; 391, 20 ; 21 ; 392, 6 ; 28 ; 393, 8 ; 10 ; 394, 1 ; 3 ; 12 ; 20 ; 23 ; 27 ; 29 ; 397, 16 ; 405, 20 ; 406, 5 ; 11 ; 12 ; 427, 17 ; 21 ; 26 ; 434, 13 ; 446, 17 ; 448, 14 ; 478, 3 ; 480, 6 ; 9 ; 494, 32 ; 495, 9 ; 15 ; **VEGET.** 2, 22 (quater) ; 3, 5 fin. ; 4, 21 ; **AUSON.** p. 14, vs. 12 (Peip.) ; 17, 31 ; 92, 19 ; 21 ; 228, 43 ; 253, 33 ; 286, 24 ; 354, 34 ; 370, 433 ; **AUCT.** **QUEROL.** p. 37, 12 (Peip.) ; **PRUDENT.** **Apoth.** 838 ; **Ham.** 87 ; **Psych.** 7 ; 713 ; **cont.** **Sym.** 2, 312 ; 1097 ; **AMM.** **MARC.** 17, 5, 14 ; **MACROB.** **Sat.** 1, 24, 4 ; 4, 6, 9 ; 5, 15, 6 ; **Som.** **Scip.** 1, 6, 66 ; 21, 5 ; **SYM.** **Epp.** 1, 37, 1 ; 84 ; 2, 91 ; 3, 32 ; 80 ; 9, 69 ;

¹ *ducitur scripti*, Buech.

80; **SERV.** Ecl. 3, 28; 9, 54; Ge. 2, 477; Aen. 1, 23; 41; 65; 108 (bis); 159; 208; 209; 228; 251; 257; 332; 343; 371 (bis); 384; 423; 435; 436 (bis); 451; 532; 744; 2, 270; 300; 3, 205; 275; 384; 4, 418; 5, 533; 7, 8; 8, 12; 110; 168; 209; 268; 9, 81; 192; 360; 452; 10, 33; 74; 419; 668; 11, 284 (bis); 463; 551; 593; 659; 12, 164; 575; **CLAUDIAN.** in Rufin. 2, 114; in Eutrop. 1, 239; 241; 2, 404; 446; de iv Consul. Honor. 523; 563; Pan. Manl. Theod. 100; de Cons. Stil. 3, 362; de Rapt. Proserp. 1, 157; 2, 63; **MART.** **CAPELL.** 3, 251; 302; 308 (bis); 311; 5, 534; 535; 7, 769; 781; 785 (ter); 786; **SALVIAN.** p. 151, 27; 152, 26; **FAUST.** p. 236, 22 (Engelbr.); 263, 17; 264, 8; 292, 6; 300, 19; 308, 27; **LUCIF.** p. 268, 22 (Hartel); 293, 15; **SID. APOLL.** Epp. 2, 6, 1; 3, 10, 1; 5, 5, 3; 6, 8, 1; 7, 14, 11; 15, 1; 8, 11, 13; 14, 4 (bis); 5; 6; 9, 16, 3; Carm. 2, 112; 308; 5, 52; 198; 406; 22, 35; **VICT. VIT.** p. 40, 5 (Petschen.); 83, 9; **PRISC. II** (K.) 197, 10; 303, 6; III, 19, 9; 127, 12; 142, 17; 252, 4; 338, 15; **BOETH.** Arith. 1, 24 (p. 49, 16 Fried.); 29 (61, 2); 31 (65, 2); 2, 29 (120, 14); 40 (138, 1); 51 (165, 23); 52 (167, 21); Mus. 1, 3 (190, 8); 24 (217, 6); 25 (218, 3); 28 (220, 3); 2, 13 (243, 5); 30 (263, 23); Geom. p. 379, 23; Consol. 1, 2 (p. 6, vs. 4 Peip.); 4 (p. 10, vs. 7); 4 (p. 14, 110); 2, 6 (p. 43, vs. 16); 4, 7 (p. 118, 38); Trin. p. 149, 6; **ENNOD.** p. 19, 12; 20, 20; 22, 15; 30, 14; 40, 15; 61, 1; 92, 17; 97, 9; 102, 14; 107, 4; 110, 24; 133, 24; 160, 7; 162, 10; 176, 13; 178, 10; 254, 23; 268, 9; 269, 18; 274, 5; 305, 13; 392, 4; 414, 17; 430, 2; 436, 4; 446, 4; 454, 6; 18; Carm. 1, 6, praef. (521, 14); 6, 2; 7, 41; 9, 72; 158; 2, 56, 10; 69, 2; 80, 7; 121, 1; 148, 1; **DIGEST.** Scaev. xxxv 2, 23; Lab. xvii, 2, 84; xxxvii, 10, 9; Javol. xviii, 1, 65; Julian. IX, 4, 34; XII, 1, 19 praef.; vol. xxxv, 1, 24; Pomp. I, 2, 2, 33 (bis); VIII, 1, 15; xxxii. 85 praef.; xxxiv, 3, 8, 3; L, 17, 20; Venul. xxi, 1, 65, 1; Callist. I, 18, 9; IV, 2, 13; Paul. I, 5, 7; II, 8, 6; xxi, 2; L, 17, 136; Ulp. II, 14, 7, 8 (bis); IV, 6, 26, 9; XLIII, 8, 2, 10; L, 16, 38; Modest. xxviii, 5, 63, 1; XLI, 1, 52; Herm. L, 17, 98; **CYPR. GALL.** Gen. 687; Exod. 450; 631; 769; 991; Num. 105; Deut. 69; 130; Jes. Nav. 533; Jud. 330; **CASSIOD.** VII (K.) 161, 15; 24; 162, 7; 163, 18.—*Imperfect*—**CURT.** 10, 1,

28 ; 4, 3 ; **SEN.** Epp. 18, 1, 33 ;¹ Apocol. 15 ; **VEL. LONG.** vii (K.) 60, 12 ; 70, 16 ; 17 ; **FRONTIN.** Aq. 95 ; **PLIN.** Epp. 1, 2, 4 ; **TERENT.** SCAUR. vii (K.) 14, 6 ; 15, 4 ; **CHARIS.** i (K.) 217, 11 ; 229, 3 ; **AMM. MARC.** 20, 11, 9 ; **SERV.** Aen. 1, 65 ; 3, 57 ; 175 ; 5, 95 ; 9, 624 ; 638 ; **CLAUDIAN.** de Bell. Poll. 377 ; Laus Ser. 134 **ENNOD.** p. 338, 4.—*Future*—**CATO**, Agr. Cult. 59 ; **CIC.** ad Fam. 1, 7, 1 ; ad Att. 11, 13, 5 ; **PROPERT.** 3, 8, 56 ; 12, 27 ; 4, 6, 73 ; **HOR.** Epp. 1, 18, 45 ; **SEN.** Controv. 2, 5, 11 ; 9, 5, 4 (bis) ; **OVID**, Her. 13, 69 ; A. A. 2, 327 ; 395 ; **CELS.** 5, 26, 22 ; **SEN.** Epp. 2, 1, 13 ; 4, 6, 4 ; 8, 2, 2 ; 12, 18, 9 ; Dial. 4, 34, 4 ; 7, 26, 7 ; de Clem. 2, 6, 3 ; de Ben. 4, 7, 1 ; Nat. Quaest. 1 prolog. 10 ; 2, 34, 3 ; de Mor. 130 ; **PLIN.** Nat. Hist. 18, 323 (bis) ; **QUINTIL.** 1, 11, 8 ; 2, 13, 3 (bis) ; 3, 7, 24 ; 4, 1, 72 ; 2, 26 ; 5, 17 ; 7, 2, 36 ; 4, 31 ; 5, 3 ; 6, 9 ; 10, 1, 22 ; 7, 29 ; 11, 1, 9 ; **PSEUD.-QUINTIL.** p. 7, 4 (Ritter) ; 70, 5 ; **STAT.** Theb. 4, 505 ; Achill. 1, 909 ; **SIL. ITAL.** 15, 113 ; **MART.** 11, 7, 2 ; 14, 7, 2 ; **PLIN.** Epp. 6, 12, 5 ; Pan. 67 ; **TAC.** Hist. 3, 51, 13 ; **JUV.** 3, 318 ; **APUL.** Met. 2, 3 ; 26 ; **TERENT.** MAUR. vi (K.) Syl. 1234 ; Met. 1566 ; 1837 ; **PALLAD.** 3, 24, 11 ; **MAR. VICTORIN.** vi (K.) 10, 11 ; 18, 18 ; 19, 20 ; **MARCELL.** p. 298, 17 (Helmr.) ; 324, 16 ; 342, 15 ; **SEDUL.** p. 313, vs. 73 (Huemer) ; **SID. APOLL.** Epp. 9, 13, 3.—*Perfect, (a) Contemporary*—**CIC.** Quinct. 19, 62 ; Balb. 20, 47 ; **SALL.** Hist. Fragg. 2, 98, 1 (Maur.) ; **PROPERT.** 1, 3, 27 ; 16, 43 ; **HOR.** Carm. 4, 9, 40 ; **SEN.** Controv. 3, 8 (ter) ; **OVID**, Rem. Am. 304 ; **VALER. MAX.** 8, 10, 1 ; **CURT.** 6, 10, 35 ; **CELS.** 2, 12 fin. ; **SEN.** Epp. 2, 1, 2 ; Dial. 2, 8, 3 ; de Ben. 2, 11, 2 ; Medea 433 ; **PLIN.** Nat. Hist. 7, 157 ; **MART.** 4, 66, 12 ; **PLIN.** Pan. 58 ; **TAC.** Agric. 1, 3 ; Ann. 1, 56, 17 ; **GELL.** 19, 8, 1 ; **CYPR.** Carm. 6, 258 ; **JUL. CAPITOL.** Ver. 5, 3 ; **MAR. VICTORIN.** vi (K.) 12, 9 ; **PRUD.** Apoth. 191 ; cont. Sym. 2, 547 ; Perist. 4, 81 ; 11, 178 ; **AMM. MARC.** 16, 5, 5 ; **SYM.** Epp. 1, 2, 7 ; **CLAUDIAN.** de Bell. Poll. 111 ; **SULP. SEVER.** p. 169, 25 (Halm) ; **MART. CAPELL.** 1, 37 ; **LUCIF.** p. 4, 16 ; 154, 19 ; **SID. APOLL.** Carm. 5, 113 ; **BOETH.** Consol. 4, 7 (p. 118, 39 Peip.) ; **DIGEST.** Pedius apud Ulp. 1, 3. 13 ; Ulp. vii, 2, 1 ; 4, 3 praef. ; **EUGIPP.** p. 5, 19

¹ fuerat = erat, cf. Blase, Geschichte des Plusquamperfekts im Lateinischen, Giessen, 1894, p. 48.

(Knoell).—(b) *Prior*—**PROPERT.** 3, 9, 3; **SEN.** Controv. 10, 6, 2; **OVID.** Her. 13, 51; **CELS.** 3, 16 init.; 4, 22 init.; 23 med.; 6, 18, 3; 9 fin.; 7, 29 fin.; 8, 10, 2 fin.; **PETRON.** 90; **SEN.** Epp. 5, 1, 18; 6, 4, 1; 9, 5, 4; 10, 1, 2; 14, 4, 17; 15, 2, 73; 18, 5, 8; 19, 1, 17; 20, 2, 1; Dial 3, 12, 1; 9, 11, 8; 12, 12, 4; de Clem. 1, 6, 1; Nat. Quaest. 2, 59, 11; **PLIN.** Nat. Hist. 2, 106; 11, 209; 15, 134; 17, 40; 18, 146; 34, 108; 35, 44; **QUINTIL.** 2, 14, 1; 10, 4, 3; 6, 1; 11, 1, 16; 3, 120; **PSEUD.-QUINTIL.** p. 18, 15 (Ritter); 46, 14; 63, 26; 166, 5; 246, 24; 307, 12; **STAT.** Theb. 10, 924; **VEL. LONG.** VII (K.) 55, 17; **MART.** 1, 105, 2; 5, 7, 2; 47, 2; 7, 18, 5; 76, 3; 9, 25, 1; 10, 42, 5; 11, 102, 8; 12, 29, 18; 57, 28; 13, 18, 2; **JUV.** 1, 165; 3, 40; **JUSTIN.** 14, 4, 7; **CYPR.** App. p. 239, 10; 243, 9; Carm. 6, 282; **AUSON.** p. 285, 15 (Peiper); **CLAUDIAN.** de Cons. Stil. 3, 60; 331; **RURIC.** p. 403, 16 (Engelbr.); **DIGEST.** Ulp. II, 14, 7, 16; IV, 6, 26, 8; XI, 7, 22; **CYPR. GALL.** Levit. 178.—*Pluperfect, Prior*—**CAES.** B. G. 5, 34, 2; **SEN.** Suas. 3, 6; Controv. 1 praef. 15; 2 praef. 2; 2 praef. 5 (bis); **OVID.** Met. 3, 495; **VALER. MAX.** 2, 1, 6 (**PAR.** also, and at 3, 6, 4); **CURT.** 10, 1, 29; **LUC.** 3, 700; **SEN.** Epp. 6, 3, 3 (bis); Dial. 4, 10, 5; 9, 15, 2; Nat. Quaes. 2, 26, 4; **SIL. ITAL.** 17, 339; **MART.** 11, 104, 14; **TAC.** Hist. 1, 10, 8; Ann. 1, 25, 4; 15, 30, 2; **JUV.** 10, 29; **FLOR.** 2 28, 18; **GELL.** 9, 5, 8; **PRUD.** Perist. 10, 703; **SULP. SEVER.** p. 204, 4; **MART. CAPELL.** 3, 227.—*Future Perfect, Prior*—**PUBLIL. SYR.** M. 11; **HOR.** Carm. 4, 10, 6; (**PORPH.** Epp. 1, 18, 45); **SEN.** Controv. 1 praef. 20; **OVID.** Fast. 4, 861; **COL.** 2, 17, 6; de Arb. 15; **CURT.** 10, 6, 15; **CELS.** 1, 8 fin.; 3, 18 fin.; 21 med.; 5, 19, 12; 7, 3 med.; 8, 10, 1 fin.; **SCRIB. LARG.** 200; **SEN.** Epp. 2, 1, 6; 5, 6, 11; 7, 7, 2; 9, 1, 1; 18, 1, 9; Dial. 4, 7, 2; 6, 8, 2; 9, 3; 12, 18, 9; Nat. Quaest. 2, 1, 4; 3 praef. 11; 4 praef. 21; 6, 23, 3 (ter); **PLIN.** Epp. 2, 6, 6; **QUINTIL.** 4, 1, 70; 76; 8, 3, 55; 11, 1, 78; **HYGIN. GROM.** 4; 32; **MART.** 5, 4, 5; 11, 95, 1; **JUV.** 5, 145; **TERENT. SCAUR.** VII (K.) 24, 2; **CYPR.** p. 430, 19; **TERENT. MAUR.** VI (K.) Lit. 199; **PALLAD.** 3, 18, 2; **MAR. VICTORIN.** VI (K.) 13, 24; 23, 2; 33, 27; **DIOM.** I (K.) 473, 11 (cf. 502, 26); **MACROB.** Som. Scip. 1, 6, 33; **MARCELL.** p. 55, 6 (Helmr.); 111; 28; 149, 26; 210, 22; 237, 32; 270, 22; 272, 5; 281, 14; 18; 292, 21; 311, 22; 327,

29; 342, 24; 345, 10; 376, 17; **SYM.** Epp. 3, 8; 7, 3; **MART.** **CAPELL.** 4, 346; **CASS.** **FEL.** 19; 33; 42; 51; 53; 59; 66; **FAUST.** p. 112, 4; 266, 23; **LUCIF.** p. 254, 24; **SID. APOLL.** Epp. 8, 14, 5; **BOETH.** Arith. 1, 29 (p. 61, 26 Fried.); Geom. p. 393, 17; **ENNOD.** p. 142, 18; 161, 17; 164, 5; 503, 19; **DIGEST.** Paul. XXXVII, 1, 6; Ulp. VII, 4, 3 praef.; Marcian. XXXIX, 4, 16, 3; **CASSIOD.** VII (K.) 172, 3.

SUBJUNCTIVE, *Present*—**SEN.** Controv. 2, 5, 11 (ter); **CURT.** 4, 10, 6; **SEN.** Epp. 6, 3, 9; Nat. Quaest. 1, 13, 1; **PLIN.** Nat. Hist. 17, 129; 18, 350; 24, 158*; 27, 7; 32, 15; 133; 34, 122; **QUINTIL.** 1, 7, 10; **PSEUD.-QUINTIL.** p. 377, 21 (Ritter); **PLIN.** Epp. 8, 20, 1; **TAC.** Ann. 1, 26, 13; 3, 69, 16; 12, 19, 8; 47, 6; **TERENT.** **SCAUR.** VII (K.) 11, 9; 12, 17; 21, 17; **AMM. MARC.** 17, 10, 4; **SID. APOLL.** Epp. 1, 7, 7; **PRISC.** II (K.) 37, 21; **DIGEST.** Scaevol. XLVI, 3, 93, 2; Ulp. L, 17, 161.—*Imperfect*—**LIVY** 27, 6, 7; 39, 33, 8; Perioch. 59, 20; **PROPERT.** 2, 1, 27; **SEN.** Controv. 7, 4, 4; 7, 19; **CURT.** 10, 4, 3; **PLIN.** Nat. Hist. 7, 141; 8, 14; 27, 69; **QUINTIL.** 1, 7, 20; 2, 4, 13; 27; 9, 4, 38; **STAT.** Silv. 5, 3, 215; **FRONTIN.** Strat. 3, 3, 4; Aq. 12; 125; **MART.** 7, 37, 3; **PLIN.** Epp. 3, 16, 4; Pan. 13; **TAC.** Hist. 1, 24, 5; 66, 19; Ann. 2, 2, 12; 34, 22; 3, 33, 14; 65, 10; 4, 31, 9; 6, 10, 13; 15, 13; 21, 1; 29, 8; 13, 3, 16; 18, 16; 27, 14; 14, 20, 9; 52, 11; 15, 13, 10; **TERENT.** **SCAUR.** VII (K.) 25, 3; 4; 18, 18; **SUETON.** Jul. 26; 28; Aug. 21; 37; 38; 41; 44; 45; 56; 57; 77; 82; Tib. 19; Calig. 4; 33; 35; Claud. 8; Nero 15; 27; 28; Galba 10; Otho 4; Domit. 2; 21; de Vir. Ill. p. 24, 3 (R.); 61, 4; 138, 17; **CYPR.** Carm. 2, 5; **JUL. CAPITOL.** M. Anton. 10, 6; **AEL. LAMPRID.** Commod. 11, 11; **MAR. VICTORIN.** VI (K.) 12, 16; 20, 7; **OBSEQ.** 21; **DIOM.** I (K.) 476, 2; **AMM. MARC.** 16, 12; 67; **CLAUDIAN.** Carm. Min. 30, 97; **DIGEST.** Javol. VIII, 1, 20; Papin. XIX, 5, 8.—*Perfect, Prior*—**OID.** Trist 5, 10, 42; **SEN.** Epp. 2, 1, 6; 19, 1, 17; Dial. 7, 24, 3; **PLIN.** Nat. Hist. 18, 259; 23, 103; 28, 11 (bis); 36, 134; **QUINTIL.** 12, 10, 33; **PSEUD.-QUINTIL.** p. 3, 1 (Ritter); 210, 2; **VEL. LONG.** VII (K.) 63, 9; 11; **TERENT.** **SCAUR.** VII (K.) 25, 19; **AMPEL.** 8, 17; **CYPR.** App. p. 33, 7; **DIOM.** I (K.) 427, 28; **AMM. MARC.** 14, 3, 1; **SYM.** Epp. 3, 65; 4, 61, 3; **SERV.** *En.* 12, 151; **CASS.** **FEL.** 38; 60;

61 ; 72 ; **FAUST.** p. 330, 24 ; **SID. APOLL.** Epp. 9, 11, 8 ; Carm. 22, § 5 ; **ENNOD.** p. 69, 4 ; 171, 8 ; 437, 23 ; 471, 16 ; Carm. 1, 8 praef. 1 ; 9, 62 ; **DIGEST.** Terent. Clemens XXXV, 2, 67 ; Ulp. VII, 1, 25, 7 ; **BOETH.** Consol. 1, 6 (p. 22, 54 Peip.) ; **CYPR. GALL.** Exod. 980.—*Pluperfect, Prior*—**LIVY** 23, 32, 3 ; **SEN.** Controv. 10 praef. 13 ; **CURT.** 6, 11, 2 ; 9, 6, 4 ; **SEN.** de Ben. 3, 32, 5 ; **PLIN.** Nat. Hist. 23, 56 ; **QUINTIL.** 6, 1, 40 ; **FRONTIN.** Strat. 4, 7, 7 ; Aq. 87 ; **TAC.** Hist. 3, 83, 3 ; Ann. 3, 71, 11 ; 4, 16, 19 ; 6, 2, 10 ; 13, 49, 8 ; **SUETON.** Aug. 99 ; Calig. 36 ; Claud. 42 ; **MAR. VICTORIN.** VI (K.) 24, 4 ; **PRUDENT.** Perist. 10, 758 ; **SERV.** Aen. 11, 517 ; **CLAUDIAN.** in Rufin. 2, 75 ; de III Consul. Honor. 25 ; de VI Consul. Honor. 82 ; **EUGIPP.** p. 33, 1.

D. CORRELATIVE: INDICATIVE, *Present*—**CATULL.** 71, 5 ; **CIC.** Vatin. 12, 29 ; de Orat. 1, 125 ; 251 ; 2, 130 (bis) ; **PUBLIL.** **SYR.** H. 13 ; **SEN.** Controv. 1, 1, 6 ; **OIDV.** Her. 19, 113 ; Met. 10, 164 ; ex Pont. 4, 9, 112 ; **COL.** 11, 3, 32 ; **CALP. SIC.** 2, 88 ; **SEN.** Epp. 19, 4, 7 ; Dial. 9, 17, 1 ; 11, 12, 3 ; Herc. O. 426* ; 614 ; **VEL. LONG.** VII (K.) 58, 10 ; 66, 7 ; **SUETON.** Prat. p. 275, 9 (Reiff.) ; **CYPR.** p. 576, 23 ; **MAR. VICTORIN.** VI (K.) 72, 15 ; **SERV.** Aen. 1, 407 ; **MART. CAPELL.** 7, 791 ; 792* ; **SALVIAN.** p. 302, 10 ; **FAUST.** p. 39, 1 ; 199, 23 ; **DIGEST.** Scaevol. XLV, 3, 19 ; Javol. VIII, 6, 15 ; XVIII, 1, 65 ; **CASSIOD.** VIII (K.) 161, 11 ; **BOETH.** Trin. p. 151, 17 (Peip.).—*Imperfect*—**OIDV.** Her. 10, 23 ; **SEN.** Dial. 5, 18, 1 ; **APUL.** Met. 10, 22.—*Future*—**CATO.** Agr. Cult. 1, 1 ; **CIC.** Marc. 6, 19 ; Rab. Post. 9, 25 ; **SEN.** Dial. 4, 7, 2 ; **PHAED.** 177 ; Herc. O. 426 ; **PLIN.** Pan. 88 ; **MART. CAPELL.** 7, 792.—*Perfect, (a) Contemporary*—**VERG.** Aen. 12, 483 ; **PORPH.** ad **HOR.** Carm. 4, 9, 40 ; **SEN.** Controv. 7, 1, 27 ; **TAC.** Ann. 14, 64, 14 ; **MIN. FEL.** p. 36, 8 (Halm) ; **CYPR.** p. 580, 7 ; **JUL. VALER.** Ort. Alex. 3, 60 ; **CLAUDIAN.** de IV Consul. Honor. 621 ; **FAUST.** p. 68, 24 ; **LUCIF.** p. 286, 4 ; **ENNOD.** p. 348, 9.—*(b) Prior*—**CIC.** Sull. 30, 83 ; **SEN.** Suas. 6, 21 ; **OIDV.** Met. 3, 451 ; **VALER. MAX.** 4, 1, 7 ; **CELS.** 4, 18 med. ; **VALER. FLACC.** 6, 683 ; **GELL.** 14, 2, 19 ; **SERV.** Aen. 9, 138 ; **DIGEST.** Ulp. III, 2, 2, 2 ; VII, 2, 3 praef.—*Future Perfect, Prior*—**SCRIB. LARG.** 232 ; **MAR. VICTORIN.** VI (K.) Met. 211, 16 ;¹ **MACROB.** 7, 8, 12 ;

¹ Cf. Teuff. Hist. Rom. Lit. § 408, 4 ; no especial fondness seems to be shown.

MARCELL. p. 335, 10 (Helmr.); **SVLIAN.** p. 302, 14; **CLAUD.** **MAMERT.** p. 93, 6 (Engelbr.); **DIGEST.** Callist. L, 16, 220 praef.; **BOETH.** Mus. 1, 3 (p. 190, 10 Fried.).

SUBJUNCTIVE, *Present*—**CIC.** ad Fam. 7, 7, 1; **LIVY** 6, 15, 7; **SEN.** Epp. 14, 2, 15; de Ben. 1, 11, 6; **GAI.** 1, 162.—*Imperfect*—**CIC.** ad Att. 1, 14, 3 (ter); **SEN.** Controv. 4, praef. 7; **PLIN.** Pan. 42; 58; **FRONTIN.** Strat. 2, 13, 7; **AEL.** **SPART.** Anton. Geta 7, 5 (bis).—*Perfect, Prior*—**PSEUD.-QUINTIL.** p. 16, 18 (Ritter); 24; **TERTULL.** p. 360, 13 (R.-W. 1); **LACT.** p. 576, 17 (L.-B. 1); **MACROB.** 7, 14, 9; **SERV.** Ecl. 1, 8; **AUGUST.** Civ. Dei 2, 1 fin.; **LUCIF.** p. 190, 9; **SID. APOLL.** Epp. 7, 14, 11.

QUOTIENSCUNQUE.

A. RELATIVE: INDICATIVE, Present—**PLAUT.** Capt. 97; Truc. 282; **CIC.** ad Fam. 6, 5, 1; 13, 41, 1; **PORPH.** ad **HOR.** Epod. 17, 52; **HYGIN.** Astron. 2, 14 med.; **VALER.** **MAX.** 8, 15, 1; **CELS.** 6, 6, 16; 7, 1 fin.; 8, 10, 1 med.; **PETRON.** 36; **PSEUD.-SEN.** Epp. ad Paul. 4; 10; **CYPR.** p. 331, 24; 706, 3; 714, 24; App. 30, 20; **CHARIS.** I (K.) 217, 11; 229, 3; **OROS.** p. 638, 17 (Zang.); **MART. CAPELL.** 7, 794; **SERV.** Ecl. 1, 37; Ge. 1, 397; **ÆN.** 1, 9; 17; 73; 77; 3, 16; 241; 384; 4, 179; **FAUST.** p. 110, 19; 226, 3; **PRISC.** II (K.) 25, 16; 33, 19; **FUL-** **GENT.** Myth. 2, 16 med.; **BOETH.** Arith. 2, 4 (p. 87, 6 Fried.); 46 (p. 150, 19); **GREG. TUR.** Vit. Patr. 20 praef.—*Imperfect*—**VALER.** **MAX.** 8, 12, 1 (**PAR.** also); **CHARIS.** I (K.) 195, 9.—*Future*—**CATO,** Agr. Cult. 151, 4; **AUCT. AD HER.** 3, 20, 34; **CIC.** Tusc. 3, 84; Fin. 5, 29; ad Fam. 16, 11, 3; de Orat. 3, 123; **LIVY** 43, 14, 6; **VITRUV.** 10, 14, 7; **DIGEST.** Alf. Var. XXXIII, 1, 22; Ulp. XXV, 4, 1, 10; **GREG. TUR.** Hist. Franc. 4, 16 med.—*Perfect, (a) Contemporary*—**NEPOS** 17, 3, 6; 18, 5, 7; 23, 1, 2; **CIC.** Prov. Cons. 1, 2; Verr. 4, 26, 57; Cat. 1, 5, 11; ad Fam. 5, 2, 9; 6, 1; 13, 69, 1; **CURT.** 5, 2, 22; **PETRON.** 85; **FRONTO**, ad Am. 1, 3 (p. 175 N.); **TERTULL.** p. 152, 11 (R.-W. 1); **ST. SILVIA,** Peregrin. 50; **OROS.** p. 189, 19; **SERV.** **ÆN.** 4, 627; **SVLIAN.** p. 20, 10; **GREG. TUR.** de Virt. S. Jul. 43.—*(b) Prior*—**VARRO**, R. R. 3, 10, 7; **LIVY** 7, 26, 5; **SEN.** Controv. 1, 8, 6; **CELS.** 7, 12, 1 fin.; **DIGEST.** Ulp. IV, 6, 26, 9.—*Pluperfect, (a) Contemporary*—**AUCT.**

BELL. AFR. 72, 1.—(b) *Prior*—**VALER. MAX.** 3, 6, 4; **PETRON.** 111.—*Future Perfect, Prior*—**CIC.** de Orat. 2, 244; Sest. 69, 146; **VITRUV.** 5, 12, 4; **CYPR.** p. 430, 18; 708, 23; 24; 709, 3; **AUGUST.** Civ. Dei 11, 31 med.; **FAUST.** p. 38, 24; **RURIC.** p. 425, 23; **DIGEST.** Ulp. l, 5, 1, 1; **BOETH.** Mus. 2, 8 (p. 236, 7 Fried.).

Subjunctive, Present—**CIC.** Brut. 4.—Imperfect—**CIC.** Phil. 5, 8, 21; Dom. 29, 78; de Orat. 1, 123; **LIVY** 5, 54, 3.—Perfect, (a) *Contemporary*—**CAES.** B. C. 1, 7, 5.—(b) *Prior*—**FRONTO**, ad Anton. 3 (p. 152 N.).—*Pluperfect, (a) Contemporary*—**LIVY** 39, 39, 11.—(b) *Prior*—**NEPOS** 7, 3, 5; **LIVY** 8, 35, 10; **AMM. MARC.** 16, 10, 18.

B. CORRELATIVE: INDICATIVE, Present—**VARRO**, R. R. 2, 4, 15; **CIC.** Cluent. 18, 51.—Future—**CIC.** de Orat. 2, 249; Planc. 6, 14.—Perfect—**CIC.** Rosc. Com. 6, 18; Dom. 26, 69; 27, 71.—*Future Perfect, Prior*—**CIC.** de Orat. 2, 137.

Subjunctive, Imperfect—**LIVY** 31, 44, 6.—Perfect—**CIC.** Verr. 5, 8, 21.

QUOTIENSQUE.

RELATIVE: INDICATIVE, Present—**COL.** 6, 17, 9; 12, 52, 16; **DIGEST.** Ulp. XLIII, 8, 2, 10; **RURIC.** p. 382, 13.—Imperfect—**ST. SILVIA**, Peregrin. 50.—Future—**COL.** 2, 4, 10; 12, 51, 2.—*Future Perfect, Prior*—**DIGEST.** Ulp. vii, 4, 3 praef.

Subjunctive, Imperfect—**SUETON.** Aug. 37; Calig. 7.

PART III.

SUMMARY.

Many authors show a distinct fondness for *quotiens* as suited to a given sphere, or appropriate for some particular feature of style, while others evidently avoid its use. In Orosius and Augustine, for example, but few occurrences were found in works of considerable extent. Of the authors in whom no examples were noted, the works are in most cases brief. Lucretius, Pomponius Mela and Probus are the most notable exceptions, the last especially, in contrast with the striking usage of other grammarians. No examples were noted in the following list :

Lucretius, Hirtius, Mela, Nemesianus, Persius, Probus, Caper, Granius Licinianus, Censorinus, Commodianus, Plotius, Publilius Optatianus, Atilius Fortunatianus, Jul. Firm. Maternus, Aurel. Victor (de Caess.), Eutropius, Dictys Cretensis, Rufinus (de Comp.), Hieronymus (de Vir. Ill.), Mall. Theodorus, Pelagonius, Agroecius, Dares Phrygius, Jordanis.

On the other hand, but two authors, Cicero and Livy, show examples in all the main divisions given, followed next in range by Cato and the Senecas, though the latter do not use the compound correlative; while Vergil, Ovid, Pseudo-Quintilian, Tacitus, Claudius Claudianus and Ennodius have *quotiens* in all its divisions, with intentional omission of the compound.

Quotiens interrogative (119 examples) is less frequent than *quotiens* in exclamation (148 examples), and these two classes combined are but little more than one-fourth of the simple relatives (1053 examples). The proportion given between interrogatives and exclamations is in reality less exact because the rhetorical question and the exclamation are so readily interchanged; cf. for example Serv. Sulpic. apud Cic. ad Fam. 4, 5, 3 *quotiens* in eam cogitationem necesse est et tu veneris et nos saepe incidimus . . . ? Ovid, Her. 16, 217 *ipse mihi quotiens iratus "adultera" dices ?*

Lucan 8, 408 *Parthorum dominus quotiens sic sanguine mixto Nascitur Arsacides?* and further, Sen. Epp. 14, 3, 9; Stat. Theb. 5, 615; Fronto, ad Ver. Imp. 2, 8; Cypr. p. 44, 15; Carm. 6, 278; 279; Arnob. p. 271, 16; Ennod. p. 9, 22; 310, 8; 9; 372, 2; 3; 426, 26; 27; 479, 27, etc.

In the exclamatory usage most of the examples, as was to be expected, refer to the past. The perfect indicative is so used in more than three-fourths of the total number of examples. Here, too, the emotional character of the elegiac in Tibullus, Propertius and Ovid adds largely to the total, though the strongly-marked rhetorical tendency¹ in Ovid must also be taken into account.

The most noteworthy features in connection with the simple relative usage are the departmental characteristics and the marked tendency toward the present indicative, contemporary, type. Epic poets, on the whole, do not use *quotiens* so freely as do the Elegiac and the Lyric poets. In prose, wherever the oratorical or rhetorical element is strong, *quotiens* is naturally in frequent use; compare the numerous examples in Cicero, the speeches in Livy,² the Senecas, Pliny the Elder, etc. No examples are found in Sallust except in fragments of speeches. Again, among medical writers where definite direction is given: As often as the fever comes on, whenever certain symptoms appear, etc., the very large percentage of future and future perfect examples is to be noted, inasmuch as *quotiens* in these authors is largely confined to the one class of examples. Compare especially Marcellus and Cassius Felix, the latter having, in indicative examples, only the future perfect with *quotiens*.

The grammarians show a characteristic no less marked in the frequency of *quotiens* in definitions and rules. Here the terms are general and the present indicative prevails. Yet this type is in the line of a general development. Observe its growth: Cicero, out of six examples of the relative, uses the present indicative but twice (not at all in the orations), Vergil out of three examples has

¹ Cf. Schanz, *Gesch. d. röm. Lit.* München. 1899, II, p. 190.

² More frequently as interrogative, however, than as relative.

it twice, but Propertius has no occurrence in seven examples, nor Livy in four. Seneca Rhetor in 24 examples has three cases, while Seneca the Younger has only 24 instances out of 71 examples. But Ovid has 15 out of 23, and Lucan five out of six. Curtius again has no occurrence in nine examples, Pliny the Elder but three out of 30, Quintilian, forerunner of the grammarians, 25 out of 55, Tacitus eight out of 40. Then the proportion becomes larger: Tertullian has four out of five, Maurus 13 out of 17, Lactantius has only the single usage in six examples, as has also Charisius in 19, Diomedes has 41 out of 45, Flavius Vegetius six of the one class, Ausonius nine out of ten, Macrobius five out of six, Servius 55 out of 63, Claudius Claudianus 11 out of 20, Martianus Capella 13 out of 17, Sid. Apoll. 18 out of 26, Priscian seven out of eight, Ennodius 37 out of 49 and Cyprianus Gallus 10 out of 12. Or by periods, until the time of Tertullian out of 414 indicative examples only 196 were of the present tense; but from Tertullian to the end of the period examined out of 471 examples, 370 are of this classification. This shows a decided falling off in the exactness obtained at an earlier period by the use of tenses of priority. Our list would appear still larger if we counted here the 39 examples out of 91 indicatives with the full compound, and four out of eight with *quotiensque*. In fact this usage became so identified with the simple form that we may find here an explanation of the comparative infrequency of the compound except in the sphere of vulgar Latin, where fullness of expression is a characteristic.

The list of examples has been carefully examined to see whether any possible conditional force in *quotiens*¹ has affected the choice of *quis* and *aliquis* in collocation, as in the ordinary use after *si*. But in both the earlier authors and the better late ones *aliquis* is the favorite, whether as nominative, or accusative or other oblique cases, in both pronominal and adjectival use.

The greater exactness of the Latin in expressing priority is shown in the 88 examples of future perfect against 66 examples

¹ Cf. the combination *si quotiens*, Ovid, Trist. 5, 10, 42; Sulp. Sever. p. 131, 5; p. 204, 4.

of the future. Note also 70 examples of the perfect prior against 43 of the perfect contemporary.¹

The total number (97) of correlatives is strikingly small in comparison with the number of times *quotiens* is used without determination. Similarly, *quotienscunque* (*quotiensque*) is used 112 times without determination, and but ten times with *totiens*. The explanation for this lies apparently in the formality or stiffness of this particular correlative. Cicero, the Senecas and Ovid are about the only classical authors with more than a few sporadic examples. Only something like the stiffness of the expression must have kept the Roman, fond as he was of antitheses and parallelisms in both prose and poetry, from making more extensive use of it here. Other correlatives, especially *quantus* . . *tantus*, *qualis* . . *talis*, constantly recur.²

One instance of *quotiens* . . *totiens* was found in an inscription, CIL. II, 3367 *quotiens poto totiens propino*.

Interesting variations in the order of correlatives occur. So for example Ovid uses *tot* . . *quot* 14 times, *quot* . . *tot* six, *totidem* . . *quot* six, *quot* . . *totidem* once. In the poets metrical considerations naturally affect the order. In general, however, the relative might be expected to precede. The examples show the order *quotiens* . . *totiens* 53 times, *totiens* . . *quotiens* 44 times. With *quotienscunque*, *totiens* invariably follows.

An emphatic *tunc* is sometimes substituted for *totiens*, especially where *quotiens* has rather the force of *cum*. Cf. for *quotiens* . . *tunc*, Valer. Flacc. 8, 364; Gell. 14, 7, 4; Mar. Victorin. VI (K.) 217, 17; Charis. II (K.) 85, 13; Diom. I (K.) 322, 11; Claud. Claudian. de Rapt. Proserp. 1, 157; Sid. Apoll. Epp. 8, 14, 4; Boeth. Mus. 1, 28 (p. 220, 3 Fried.) ; 2, 13 (243, 5)—nine examples. For *tunc* . . *quotiens*, Vel. Long. VII (K.) 63, 6; Sil. Ital. 15, 113; Juv. 14, 21;

¹ The aoristic perfect has not been treated separately; but few examples occur, cf. Juv. 3, 40; Mart. 5, 72; and associated in Claudian. in Eutrop. 1, 239.

In another class, the present (= fut.) associated with a future has been treated as contemporary; cf. Col. 6, 17, 9; Sen. de Ben. 4, 7, 1; Stat. Achill. 1, 909; Hygin. Grom. 43; Mar. Victorin. VI (K.) 10, 10; 199, 14; Mart. Capell. 7, 792; Prisc. II (K.) 303, 6. See also, Werth, de Terentiani Sermone, Jahrb. Spbd. XXII, pp. 345, 369.

² Cf. Draeger, II, 520 ff.; and Weise, Char. d. lat. Sprache, Leipzig. 1891, p. 19.

Terent. Maur. vi (K.) Lit. 199; Mar. Victorin. vi (K.) 83, 12; Charis. i (K.) 173, 9; Ennod. p. 454, 18; Carm. 1, 9, 62; 72; Digest. Callist. iv, 2, 13; Ulp. vii, 1, 25, 7; Cassiod. p. 161, 24—12 examples. The balance in favor of the latter class, though not large, would seem to indicate that when *quotiens* precedes, *tunc* is less likely to be substituted for *totiens*.

Sometimes, as in the case of other correlatives, the forms do not correspond; compare for illustration *tanta . . quam*, Ter. Hec. 416; Verg. Aen. 6, 352; frequent in Livy, 26, 1, 3; 37, 51, 9, etc., Tac. Dial 6 (see Gudeman's note); *quanto . . tam*, Lucret. 5, 463. Such examples, however, are not frequent.¹ The following instances for *quotiens* have been noted: *tot . . quotiens*, Sall. Hist. 2, 98, 1 (Maur.); *totiens . . quot*, Livy 2, 13, 2; Plin. Nat. Hist. 26, 64; 36, 101; Apul. p. 324 ad fin. (Hild.); *quot . . totiens*, Valer. Flacc. 1, 580; Boeth. Arith. 2, 4 (p. 87, 4 Fried.).

While *quotienscunque* belongs to prose, with the unimportant exception of two examples in Plautus, it cannot be limited to any one sphere. The 122 examples found (counting here the ten examples of *quotiensque*) are scattered through a wide range of authors. With Plautus, Cato, Nepos, Vitruv., Auct. Bell. Afric., Col., Cels., Petron., Fronto, Tertull., Silvia, Ammianus, Gregory, and other similar names in the list, there would seem at first glance to be a distinct tendency toward vulgar usage. Nepos² has only the compound, four examples, while Petronius³ has five examples against a single *quotiens*; Vitruvius⁴ and Fronto have each a proportion of two to one, but the number of examples is small. In many of the other authors *quotiens* outnumbers the compound, while in such an author as Apuleius only *quotiens* is found. Cicero even seems to prefer *quotienscunque* in the orations and rhetorical works, though in a large number of these examples it is evident that he aimed purposely at the additional emphasis of the compound; cf. Verr. 4, 26, 57; Cat. 1, 5, 4; Phil. 5, 8, 21; Dom. 78, etc. On the other hand, in the letters *quotiens* is used nine times (three times, however, in anaphora, ad Att. 1, 14, 13), *quotienscunque* six times; cf. again the special emphasis in such an example as ad Fam.

¹ Cf. Draeger, II, § 521.

² Teuff. § 198.

³ Durch und durch vulgär, Wölff, Philol. xxxiv, 145.

⁴ Miodonski, ALL. viii, 146.

16, 11, 3 tu etiam atque etiam cura, ut valeas litterasque ad me mittas, quotiencunque habebis, cui des. It is safe to conclude that Cicero merely used the compound with greater exactness than is found in most of his successors. That the simple and the compound relative were not always carefully distinguished has been shown in Part I, but the comparatively small number of compounds in the language is due not so much to this inaccuracy as to the increasing number of present indicative examples with the simple relative having a general force.

The summary thus far has dealt chiefly with indicative examples, and their classification has been relatively simple. But in turning to the subjunctive usage much greater difficulty is encountered. Omitting the interrogative subjunctives, as indirect and therefore outside of the present discussion, we find in the various relative classes approximately 200 subjunctive examples against five times as many of the indicative. Of these approximately 200 examples, considerably over 50 per cent. represent uses of the mode common in all periods, such as by attraction, or in the subordinate clause of indirect discourse, while about 86 examples are of the so-called iterative usage. Yet with the exception of fewer than a half dozen examples, as listed below, these 86 examples are found only with the simple relative and the proportion then becomes practically one-half of all the subjunctives in this class. In thus narrowing the count, however, to a single category it will be observed that the proportion given is deceptive; and after all, the vital question is why other possible classes do not show numerous examples of the iterative, and why with the simple relative the proportion of indicative examples is so overwhelmingly large that reasonable expectations, aroused by the natural force of *quotiens* and encouraged by Draeger and other grammarians, have been disappointed. Does the meaning of *quotiens* naturally invite the iterative subjunctive, or is the point of view merely a summing up in retrospect¹ with the indicative?

An unqualified assent cannot be given to either alternative. The usage of the language in a large measure apparently contradicts the

¹ For the phraseology, cf. Gildersleeve-Lodge, Lat. Gram. § 567, note, in remarks on the indicative vs. the subjunctive in general for iterative sentences.

first, while on the other hand the retention of the indicative so generally in iterative tenses after the iterative subjunctive had become well established may be due in part to the conservative influence of an overwhelming growth in the use of the present indicative with general conditional force. This growth, as already shown above, served materially to restrict the use of *quotiencumque* in later Latin, and in the present connection it is perfectly conceivable that it helped even in other tenses to hold the indicative in line. Especially is this true where there could be little or no idea of description, characterization or other such connotation to facilitate the extension of the subjunctive.¹

¹ Prof. Hale has even maintained, in connection with *cum*, that the subjunctive for repeated action in Latin is simply an extension of the ordinary use of the *cum*-clause of situation. "The subjunctive of repeated action is generally believed to appear first in the imperfect and pluperfect tenses, and for a considerable time to be confined to these tenses. This is precisely what would be expected if the change is due to the influence of the narrative *quom*-clause,—itself always in the pluperfect or imperfect. But if the change were due to the idea of potentiality, there would be no reason why that idea should not take effect in the present or perfect as well; and, similarly, if the change were due to Greek influence, the use of the subjunctive in secondary tenses under the model of the Greek generalizing optative would be inseparable from the use of the subjunctive in primary tenses under the model of the Greek generalizing subjunctive." The Cum Constructions, II (1889), p. 237. Cf. also Brenous, Étude sur les Hellenismes dans la Syntaxe latine, Paris, 1895, p. 362 ff. The initial idea of *doppelte Modalität* is pushed to its extreme by J. B. Sturm, Ueber iterative Satzgefüge im Lateinischen (Program) Speier, 1890/91, in which examples are classed as iterative-causal, iterative-concessive, iterative-conditional (potential), etc.

M. Bonnet, Le Subjonctif de Répétition, Revue de Philologie, VIII (1884), p. 75, had already advanced the idea that the so-called iterative subjunctive instead of marking the idea of repetition, as claimed in some quarters (though expressly denied by Kühner, Ausf. Gram. d. lat. Sprache, II, § 182, 9), was even used in spite of that idea: On doit trouver pour le moins bizarre, s'il est dans la nature du subjonctif de marquer l'idée de répétition, que les meilleurs écrivains semblent éviter ce mode quand ils veulent exprimer cette idée Les subjonctifs de cette espèce peuvent et doivent s'expliquer de même que s'il s'agissait de faits isolés et non répétés. Le subjonctif est employé, dans ces exemples comme ailleurs, parce que l'action de la proposition subordonnée et celle de la principale, au lieu d'être simplement juxtaposées, sont présentées dans leur relation logique L'indicatif s'est maintenu plus longtemps, comme le constate la règle des anciennes grammairies, parce qu'il était naturel de considérer surtout, dans une action répétée, le simple parallélisme entre cette action et un autre fait, également répété. L'écrivain, bien souvent, restait libre d'établir une connexion plus étroite entre les deux séries de faits Mais, en somme, l'idée de

The subjunctive in *quotiens* clauses was, therefore, not taken up so early as in the *cum* clauses, nor was its use at any period ever so free. The earliest example for *cum* cited by Dittmar is Enn. Ann. 294 (M.); examples are then found with some frequency in Caesar and Cicero. Lupus¹ cites thirteen examples in Nepos; but it is in the silver and later Latinity of Valerius Maximus, Pliny the Elder, Tacitus, Florus, Suetonius, and the Scriptores Historiae Augustae that the construction is most at home; cf. Schmalz,³ § 311. *Si* in the iterative clause appears at least as early as Catullus 84, 1.

Chommoda dicebat, *si* quando commoda vellet
Dicere, et insidias Arrius hinsidias,

where, however, *si quando* is practically equivalent to *cum*, or even *quotiens* might have been used. By the time of Caesar, Nepos and Cicero other particles and relatives have become associated. At this period, for the sake of safety, all subjunctives with *quotiens* répétition, loin de motiver l'emploi du subjonctif, a été cause pendant longtemps du maintien de l'indicatif. Au lieu donc d'affirmer que le subjonctif sert à marquer l'idée de répétition, on devrait montrer dans quelles conditions et pour quelles raison le subjonctif s'est introduit, dans les exemples dont nous parlons, malgré l'idée de répétition.

On the other hand, Draeger, Hist. Synt. II, p. 574, Schmalz, Lat. Synt.³ §§ 274, 311 and Riemann, Synt. lat., pp. 331 and 353-355, hold the widely accepted view that this use of the subjunctive is due to the influence of the Greek optative. Dittmar, Stud. z. lat. Moduslehre, Leipz. 1897, p. 146, is less positive, though he seems to share die Meinung der Konjunktiv sei in iterativen Sätzen eigentlich etwas Unlateinisches oder wenigstens etwas Unklassisches. Dittmar's list, however, is only illustrative and some of his earlier examples cannot be viewed without reasonable doubt.

The whole usage while due to Greek influence originally, and even directly so at times later on, seems to have been modified in its possibilities by developments taking place in the Latin itself. It thus became early identified with *cum*, and by consequence with the narrative tenses, though it was restricted to neither the one nor the other. The transition, however, to *ut*, *ubi* and other general relatives with the imperfect and the pluperfect was more readily effected than was the extension of the present and the perfect tenses, where the indefinite second person and the potential construction did partial service. That another force is often present, especially in earlier examples, where the subjunctive is associated with the idea of repetition is true (cf. Mdvg. Klein. Phil. Schriften, Leipz. 1875, p. 233), but M. Bonnet has carried his statement too far in saying that each subjunctive should be explained in the same manner as for a single action; cf. Riemann, Études sur Tite-Live,² Paris, 1885, p. 294, n. 1.

¹ Sprachgebr. d. Corn. Nepos, Berl. 1876, p. 153.

have been accounted for by every other means possible, even when the idea of repeated action was clearly in the sentence ; as in Nepos 7, 3, 5 *quare fiebat ut omnium oculos, quotienscunque in publicum prodisset*,¹ ad se converteret ; cf. similar cases of attraction in Livy 8, 35, 10 ; 23, 32, 3 ; Curt. 10, 4, 3 ; Plin. Nat. Hist. 7, 141 ; Quint. 2, 4, 27 ; Frontin. Aq. 87 ; Tac. Hist. 1, 24, 5 ; and even in Sueton. Aug. 44 ; 57 ; de Vir. Ill. p. 138, 17 (Reiff.), although the strong tendency toward the so-called iterative subjunctive in Sueton. is pointed out by Draeger II, p. 584, and the subjunctive in the passages cited is not necessarily due wholly to attraction ; cf. Sen. Controv. 1, 2, 15 *iubemur ut, quotiens possumus, de omnibus legis verbis controversiam faciamus* ; Quintil 1, 11, 8 *curabit . . . ut, quotiens exclamandum erit, lateris conatus sit ille non capit*is ; Plin. Epp. 6, 12, 5 ; Jul. Capitol. Ver. 5, 3 ; Serv. Aen. 3, 241 ; 384.²

Clearer cases of subjunctives due to indirect discourse, though the idea of repeated action is present, may be seen in Livy 31, 44, 6 *sacerdotes publicos, quotienscunque pro populo Atheniensi sociisque, exercitibus et classibus eorum precarentur, totiens detestari atque exsecrari Philippum* ; 39, 39, 11 *gratias populo Romano egit, quod tanto studio, quotiencunque declarandae voluntatis potestas facta esset, praetorem se voluisse facere* ; and, similarly, Petron. 117 ; Plin. Nat. Hist. 8, 14 ; Tac. Ann. 2, 34, 23 ; 3, 65, 10 ; 71, 11 ; Sueton. Calig. 4 ; Ner. 28 ; Galba 10.

In Curtius 9, 6, 4 *mos erat principibus amicorum et custodibus corporis excubare ante praetorium, quotiens adversa regi valetudo incidisset*, the subjunctive depends upon the infinitive construction, as stated by Draeger, though the example is classed by him as an iterative. With this may be compared Pseudo-Quintil. p. 377, 21 (Ritter) *consuetudine iudiciorum consequens est, q. aliqua propria actio in rem non detur, uti proxima et simili* ; Tac. Ann. 12, 47, 6

¹ Lupus, p. 155, classes this as iterative.

² Many later examples of non-attraction are omitted, especially after the language has reached the point where it often chooses to fare without the "luxury of a subjunctive." Cf. conspicuous examples in Amm. Marc. 20, 5, 4 *retexere superfluum puto, q. hieme cruda . . . indomitos antea . . . reppulimus Alamannos* ; Cassiod. VII (K.) 161, 15 *Donatus dicit, q. u et i seu sibi seu aliis vocalibus praeponuntur, loco habendas esse consonantium*.

mos est regibus, q. in societatem coeant, implicare dextras. The last example is followed by a clear case of the perfect subjunctive in the same usage with *ubi*: *mox ubi sanguis in artus extremos suffuderit, levi ictu cruentum eliciunt.*¹

One-third, or more, of the examples to be quoted are found in Tacitus and Suetonius, with by far the larger number in the latter. Prior to Tacitus the earliest example is Livy 5, 54, 3, *fatebor vobis . . . cum abessem, quotienscunque patria in mentem veniret, haec omnia occurabant, colles campique et Tiberis, etc.* Here the compound relative emphasizes the iteration, although the subjunctive in the clause might be due to Livy's having had in mind *haec omnia occurrisse* to follow *fatebor*. Certainly at the end of the sentence, which continues, *et hoc coelum sub quo natus educatusque essem, the subjunctive is due to the thought in the mind of the speaker Camillus.* Other instances of the imperfect are Sen. Controv. 4 praef. 7 q. *velles eandem rem et quamdiu velles*² *diceret, aliis totiens figuris (sc. dicebat); Quintil. 1, 7, 20, q. S littera media vocalium longarum . . . esset, geminabatur; 2, 4, 13 q. eandem materiam rursus a me tractatam scribere de integro iuberem; 9, 4, 38 q. ultima esset (sc. littera S); Stat. Silv. 5, 3, 215 *Latios q. ego carmine patres Mulcerem; Frontin. Aq. 12 q. siccitates egerent auxilio; Strat. 2, 13, 7 q. prima luce moveret; ibid. 3, 3, 4 q. acie decertaretur; and it is not surprising to find that the younger Pliny has the construction already allowed by his master Quintilian;*³ cf. Epp. 3, 16, 4 q. *cubiculum eius intraret, vivere filium . . . simulabat; Pan. 13 q. . . . clipeo gravior ictus incideret; ibid. 42 q. quisque similes principi servos haberet.**

For the pluperfect up to the time of Tacitus, but three examples are to be cited: Sen. Controv. 10 praef. 13 hi (sc. rhetores) q. *conflixissent, penes Gallionem palma; Plin. Nat. Hist. 23, 56 ab aspide percussus utrem aceti ferens, q. deposuisset, sentiebat ictum; Quintil. 6, 1, 40 q. respexisset patronus.*

Examples of the present and the perfect subjunctives of iteration

¹ Dittmar, p. 149, cites both the examples from Tacitus, Prof. Hale, p. 239, only the latter.

² The post potential force is of course still felt.

³ Cf. Plin. Epp. 2, 14, 10, in another connection.

tion¹ are neither so numerous as the other two tenses, nor so early. For the period selected above, the following instances may be cited : Plin. Nat. Hist. 17, 129 atque ita alia arbore ex eadem iuvenescente iterumque et q. opus sit ut aevis eadem oliveta constant ; 18, 350 sunt et ipsius lunae VIII articuli, q. in angulos solis incidat ; 34, 122 q. opus sit molliri vim eius, mel adsperrgitur ; Plin. Epp. 8, 20, 1 quod differimus tamquam saepe visuri quod datur videre, q. velis cernere.—Sen. Epp. 19, 1, 17 hoc itaque ipse mihi dico, q. tale aliquid praestinxerit oculos meos ; Plin. Nat. Hist. 18, 259 senescunt prata restitique debent . . . , praeterea q. secta sint siciliri ; 23, 103 fit et oleum ex his quod melinum vocavimus, q. non fuerint in umidis nata ; 36, 134 palmati circa Mundam in Hispania . . . reperiuntur, idque q. fregeris, etc.

Later writers with the exception of Suetonius have held rather to the classical usage with the indicative. In Tacitus an interesting development presents itself. The early *Dialogus*, *Agricola* and *Germania*, which show most strongly the influence of classical models, contain only indicative examples ; the *Historiae* show but two examples² 1, 66, 19 q. pecuniae materia deesset, stupris et adulteriis exorabatur, and 3, 83, 3 q. pars altera inclinasset, while in the *Annales*, where the author is most under the influence of contemporary usage, six instances are found : 2, 2, 12 q. per urbes

¹ The use of these tenses in this manner has not always been granted, especially since Madvig's note denying the usage in the perfect in Cic. de Fin. 5, 41 : Librarii tamen, quibus post *cum* coniunctivus modus magis placebat, non raro aut *u* litteram in *i* mutarunt aut notam illam qua *er* significatur, addiderunt . . . editoresque habuerunt obsequentes. Madvig, therefore, in his second edition of *Livy*, adopted Wesenberg's *fuit* for *fuerit* of the mss. in 1, 32, 8 quicunque ei primus vir obvius fuerit. The ms. reading, however, is stoutly defended by Frizell, Epilegg. ad T. Liv. lib. I, Upsala, 1881, p. 49, who adds, with reference to *Livy's* whole usage, iam per se credibile atque ad fidem pronum est etiam in perfectis et praesentibus eum ab usu coniunctivi non abhoruisse. In his review of Frizell, Revue critique, 1881, II, p. 89, Riemann denies this usage for the particular example and in general. Later, however, he withdraws his general objection : J'ai combattu cette opinion, peut-être d'une manière trop absolue . . . je crois aujourd' hui que cet emploi du subjonctif dont parle Frizell a pû en effet exister en latin. Études sur Tite-Live, Paris, 1885, p. 297 ; cf. also Draeger II, p. 573, and Dittmar, p. 149, Anm.

² Cf. Hist. 1, 10, 8 nimiae voluptates, cum vacaret ; q. *se* expedierat, magnae virtutes, where the indicative is retained even in violation of symmetry. See Wölff., abstract, I. I. p. 399.

incederet; 4, 3, 19 promptus eloquebatur, q. subveniret; 6, 10, 13 q. necessitas ingrueret; 15, 13 q. curiam ingrederetur: 21, 1 q. super tali negotio consultaret, edita domus parte . . . utebatur; 13, 3, 16 q. meditata dissereret.

Further examples of the two common tenses may be cited by reference alone.

Imperfect—Terent. Scaur. VII (K.) 25, 18; Sueton. Jul. 26; 28; Aug. 21; 38; 41; 45; 56; 77; 82; Tib. 19; Calig. 7 (*quotiensque*); 33; 35; Claud. 8; Nero 15; 27; Otho 4; Domit. 2; 21; de Vir. Ill. p. 24, 3 (Reiff.); 61, 4; Ael. Lamprid. Commod. 11, 11; Mar. Victorin. VI (K.) 12, 17; Jul. Paris ad Valer. Max. 8, 10, 1; Claudian. Carm. Min. 30, 97.

Pluperfect—Sueton. Aug. 99; Calig. 36; Claud. 42; Plin. (Med.) 3, 30 ad fin; Prudent. Perist. 10, 758; Serv. ad Aen. 11, 517; Claudian. de III. Cons. Honor. 25; de VII. C. H. 82; in Rufin. 2, 75; Eugipp. Vit. Sanct. Sever. p. 33, 1.

In this second period but three examples of the present subjunctive in iterative clauses have been noted: Terent. Scaur. VII (K.) 11, 9 per immutationem, ut cum at coniunctionem per d scribunt et eandem, q. praepositio sit, per t; Sid. Apoll. Epp. 1, 7, 7 q. desperatum furor arripiat; Prisc. II (K.) 37, 21 in Graecis vero, q. huiuscemodi fiat apud nos diaeresis paenultimae syllabae, i pro duplice consonante accipitur.

Examples of the perfect, however, are somewhat more numerous, though sometimes, as in Cass. Felix, for example, it is difficult to distinguish the future perfect from examples belonging properly in this category. With the exception of Cassius Felix and Ennodius, the examples are sporadic. Terent. Scaurus again has one instance, VII (K.) 25, 19 q. ergo a liquida littera sequens coepit verbum . . . primam litteram geminant; cf. further Ampel. 8, 17 sed q. ventus aut pluvia fuerit non movet; Cypr. App. p. 33, 7 sic q. tempestatibus diu nauta fatigatus litora tuta contigerit, felicitatem suam de perpresso periculo dicit; Lactant. p. 576, 17 (L.-B. 1) totiens sacrificat, q. bonum aliquid ac pium fecerit; Diom. I (K.) 427, 28 q. inter duas vel plures consonantes posita sit; Serv. Ecl. 1, 8 unde necesse est, pastores totiens aras imbuere, q. mutaverint pascua; Cass. Felix 38 contingit frequentur . . . , q. plus frigoris quam possit natura corporis ferre sustinuerint laborantes; 60 con-

tingunt frequenter . . . , q. glandulosa fuerint ipsa inguina ; 61 et fit q. tumor epatis et splenis apparuerit ; 72 contingit vero hoc, q. ipsa violentia insurrexerint animalia ; Ennod. p. 69, 4 condicio, quae q. desideriis aliquo sapore responderit, mox et in foribus concessa permutat ; 171, 8 q. votiva res repente contigerit, pretium de ipsa temporis brevitate sortitur ; 437, 23 blandimentum est, q. laborem gloria ingesta praecesserit ; 471, 16 reducitur puritas, q. generalitatis oculos expiaveris cruce noxiorum ; Carm. 1, 8 praef. 1 non ponit fistulam q. rusticum pecus agrestis pastor inspexerit ; Cypr. Gall. Exod. 980 q. sementem sparseris agro.
